BV
825
T5

Thomas 147490
At the Lord's table.

DATE DUE

[illegible] JUN			
MAY 6 1968			
MAY 10 1982			
JUN 4 1984			
JUN 0 2 1993			
APR 2 2 1999			

Subject To Recall After 2 Weeks
LIBRARY
NORTH DAKOTA
STATE UNIVERSITY
FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA

Kf

3 cu
1 00

WITHDRAWN

AT THE LORD'S TABLE

DAVID OWEN THOMAS, M.D.

AT THE LORD'S TABLE

BY

DAVID OWEN THOMAS, M.D.
MASTER, ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS
LONDON

Sursum Corda

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

147190
N. D. S. U. LIBRARY
FARGO, N. D.

COPYRIGHT, 1927
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

BV
825
T5

AT THE LORD'S TABLE
— D —
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

EDITOR'S PREFACE

Signs of a renewed interest in the Lord's Supper are not wanting. On the one hand we have witnessed the Eucharistic Congress of the Catholic Church; again, we have noted the general trend of Anglo-Catholicism in large sections of England and in some quarters in America toward the Catholic conception of the Mass and the Adoration of the Host in the Holy Communion. In large areas of Christendom there is a decided trend toward an appreciation of liturgical formulæ.

Among the non-liturgical churches the Lord's Supper offers the only available symbol of a common spiritual fellowship and is, therefore, the only real bond in the unity of God's people. Baptism unfortunately has been a controversial theme and in many places has become a divisive factor. The Lord's Supper offers, however, a common symbol in which each individual may find expressed his own religious experience and whose social meanings may become the bond to unite where other things have divided. When we meet together to eat bread and drink wine we forget our differences and are bound together in mystical union with Christ our Lord.

Again, we have gained a new appreciation of the appeal to the eye. Catholicism has always understood it. But what is important to us is that Protestants have been using the eye-gate for truth in the newer methods of religious education and objective methods of teaching. This principle has given a new

raison d'être to the visible symbols of the church. Men who had tended to discard these now see in them a sound educational principle. These non-mystical minds may not concede the Real or Spiritual Presence of Christ in the bread, but they can use the symbol as the vehicle of a spiritual truth. The mystic has a direct spiritual intuition; to the practical man it offers a religious appeal and gives voice to a religious expression.

The present work—a labor of love extending over thirty years in the life of a busy physician, Doctor Thomas—has grown out of the conviction of the permanence and worth of the worship centering in the communion. Doctor Thomas was a native of Wales, educated in the land of his birth and in America. He graduated from the Indiana Medical College and later from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; took special research in the Royal College of Physicians, London, and the Royal College of Surgeons of England. He was for some years professor of Genito-Urinary diseases in Hamline University, but gave most of his life to a successful medical practice in Minneapolis, Minnesota. He was a member of many learned and scientific societies and a frequent contributor to medical journals. He died in that city February 11, 1925.

Finding no adequate library in this country, Doctor Thomas made extended trips abroad, and collected one of the finest private libraries in existence in the fields of early Christian literature, the early versions of the gospels as well as many uncial and cursive manuscripts.

Doctor Thomas combines devotion and scholarship.

The addresses have grown out of his own life as an elder presiding at the communion table, and the textual and critical study is the foundation on which they were built. To the student this volume will offer rich reward and for public worship or private meditation it will give inspiring suggestion.

ARTHUR J. CULLER.

Hiram College,
Hiram, Ohio.

INTRODUCTION

The present book is naturally divided into two parts: Part I, consisting of communion meditations emphasizing some phase of the love of our Lord which would fittingly enrich faith and inspire worship; and Part II, consisting of a textual and historical investigation of early Christian literature as to the origin and meaning of the Lord's Supper. While the two parts are kept distinct, the object of the second is to provide a surer foundation for the faith expressed in the first.

The addresses are the meditations of years during which the author officiated at the communion table. Although they were always prepared beforehand, the inspiration of the living audience suggested new phases of thought and a happier phrasing. They are given with the hope that even in non-liturgical churches they may inspire distinctive and refreshing discourses.

Several problems are undertaken in Part II—problems which have baffled the best scholarship:

1. What was the Passover ritual in the time of our Lord and how was the last supper celebrated?

2. What is the true text of the Lord's Supper in Luke's Gospel?

3. The sources and development of the communion liturgy and doctrine.

In the pursuit of this subject I have investigated the best English and German authorities on Textual Criticism and Christian Antiquities. Although being fairly well acquainted with modern research upon the

Lord's Supper, I have used only that which is in line with constructive criticism and have deemed it inadvisable to burden these pages with rationalizing theories. This study has led me to the conclusion that the Eucharist did not arise through a misunderstanding of Jesus on the part of the early church, but rather that it is an authoritative expression of the divine mind.

It is hoped that the themes may be suggestive for communion messages. Some of them in their present form are too long for ordinary use, but have been given thus to complete a single subject or develop one theme. It is hoped that they may prove to be irenic in spirit and that nothing offensive to any communion may be found.

I am indebted to both Catholic and Protestant authors. The index will acquaint the student with an unusually wide range of authorities. I have received helpful and courteous communications from Sir F. G. Kenyon, of the British Museum; Mgr. G. Mercati, of the Vatican Library; the late Professor Caspar Rene Gregory; as well as Professors H. A. A. Kennedy, E. J. Goodspeed, H. A. Saunders, and M. Reu. My indebtedness to my friend, Rev. Henry Hartig, for assistance in the translation of German authorities and many suggestions is very great.

I am under special obligations to the late Professor E. Nestle, who has read my chapter on the Text, and which has been since revised, and to Dean Arthur J. Culler, who has carefully read the entire manuscript and offered valuable suggestions.

David Owen Thomas.

Minneapolis, Minnesota.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editor's Preface	v
Introduction	ix

PART I: COMMUNION TALKS AND LENTEN ADDRESSES

The Communion Spirit	15
The Memory-Time	20
The Night of the Betrayal	24
Breaking of Bread	28
Love in the Supper	31
Three Commemorative Truths	33
He Was Known in the Breaking of Bread	36
Remembrance and Imitation	39
Paul's Tradition of the Lord's Supper	42
The First View of the Cross	44
The Guest Chamber	46
The Old and the New in the Supper	50
The Cup of Blessing	54
Thanksgiving	58
In Remembrance, Not in Honor, of Him	62
Christ Our Passover	63
The Cup of the Kingdom	64
The Righteousness of the Kingdom	66
Christ's Divinity in the Supper	68
Christ's Humanity in the Supper	72
The Bread of Life	74
The Lord's Supper an Interpretation	77
Bible Memorials	80

PAGE

The Communion Peace 82
Easter 84
The Lord Is Risen Indeed 86
The Gospel in the Supper 88
The Family Idea of the Supper 90
The Communion Homily 92
Anticipation in Communion 94
Times of Refreshing 98
The Sacramental Idea in the Supper 100
The Suffering Savior 104
The Real Presence 105
The Grace of the Communion 111
Weekly Communion 113
A Sunday With Paul 117
The Great Companion 119
The Supper a Memorial 121
A Parting Request 123
A Talk to New Communicants 127
Eating and Drinking Unworthily 129
Communion With the Sick 132
Christmas 135
Self-Examination 137
A New Year's Communion 139
The Communion Hymn 141
The Lord's Supper and the Disciples of Christ 144

PART II: CRITICAL DISSERTATIONS

Problems of the Text 155
The Last Supper 207
The Lord's Supper in the Apostolic Age 229
Communion of the Sub-Apostolic Age 240
Modern Criticism and the Lord's Supper 264

Part I

COMMUNION TALKS AND LENTEN ADDRESSES

THE COMMUNION SPIRIT

Sursum corda

Whole books have been written on the evidential value of the Lord's Supper,[1] and undoubtedly its historic testimony is very great, but the sacrament was not instituted to make disciples, but was given primarily as a memorial and communion to confirm, comfort, and strengthen believers. Moreover, its enjoyment is not dependent on the communicant's degree of knowledge, but rather upon the communion spirit to approach in faith to partake with reverence and humility. But as we have in the Lord's Supper an epitome of the gospel, our interpretation of its meaning and importance is an index of our faith and type of religion. Paul taught that without self-preparation it is possible for the Lord's Supper to be an unworthy communion, "for he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body."

I. *What is required in this discernment?* It surely implies such *recognition* as will sense in the elements an adequate remembrance of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. A sympathetic discernment through which the sacrifice and love of our blessed Lord are as real to our faith as the elements are to our senses.

(1) It should be a spirit of worship and remembrance. All the ancient Liturgies began the actual Communion Service with the exhortation, "*Sursum*

[1] Rev. George Frederick Maclear, D.D., *The Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist*, London, 1883.

corda" (Lift up your hearts), and the invocation, "*Gratias agamus*" (Let us give thanks).[1] Worship always looks and lifts up, and in ceremonial times sought the higher places, perhaps because it ever seeks purer consecration. The same idea of lifting up is found also in the word altar (*altus*, high), which was the essential means of primitive worship. The thought prevailing in the Liturgies implies that the communion calls for the spirit of prayer, so that the heart, the altar of spiritual worship, may be lifted up out of sin and depravity, which are low and debasing. In the quiet of the hour it is befitting that the heart with renewed preparation should breathe a prayer for the Holy Spirit to enlighten and purify our minds and perpetuate in us that communion spirit which will "overcome all evil inclinations and triumph over every evil habit."[2]

(2) It should be a spirit of consecration and thanksgiving. But who can properly express the true communion spirit, which with sincere penitence and humiliation deplores its own sin and waywardness as it hungers for God. This thirst for God is the essence of communion,[3] for the "bread of life" and "water of life" are abundant only for those who are truly hungry. Peter said, "Ye are a holy priesthood." If then the communicant officiates to break the bread of life for himself, the consecration which the Communion

---

[1] Rev. William Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, Vol. ii, p. 112, London, 1845. F. E. Brightman, M.A., *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1896.

[2] Rev. J. H. Garrison, *Alone with God*, p. 6, St. Louis, 1891.

[3] "Religion is the thirst for God, and its satisfaction." Rev. W. R. Inge, *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion*, p. 38, 1924.

requires is self-consecration.[1] In the Passover celebration the Jew was a priest in his own home, and to consecrate his household took a candle in search for, and to remove the leaven; in like manner let the communicant with the candle of remembrance search his heart to remove the dross and answer the question: Am I a loyal follower of Jesus Christ and in the spirit of the Upper Room to honor the request, "This do in remembrance of me?"

We may gain another lesson with regard to consecration if we will recall with what reverence and purification, and mediation which typifies ours, the Jewish priest entered the sanctuary and waited upon God. Therefore, with memories of the "wondrous cross on which the Prince of glory died," as the elements go round, there is nothing more befitting than a contrite spirit and prayer of thanksgiving.

(3) This sense of thanksgiving should make the Breaking of Bread a sacrament of fellowship and service. The joint-participation conveys to it the spirit of larger fellowship and the kinship of universal brotherhood. Every blessed Communion should impart a foretaste of the higher fellowship and wider comradeship.[2] The spirit of the Communion is to

---

[1] Consecration as a Liturgical term is misleading, for to many it suggests something more than thanksgiving. But no words said over bread and wine can make them more holy; they are merely set apart to a sacred purpose by thanksgiving.

[2] The communion spirit partakes of the larger fellowship and includes the Church Universal. It has been observed by Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D., "That if we build up our Christianity on a biblical basis the unity of Christianity is profoundly sacramental. It is based upon Baptism and the Lord's Supper. "By one spirit are we all baptized into one body." "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the

make the death of the cross remind us that love is the first essential of discipleship; and love lives for others, not for self. "I am in the midst of you, as he that serveth." This fellowship of helpfulness was the keynote of early Christianity which won the world for Christ, and which is being rediscovered by the Church of the Twentieth Century.

II. *The joy of the communion spirit.* It was said of the primitive disciples that, "Day by day continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple and breaking bread at home they did eat their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." Christianity had to coin words unknown to the pagan world to express its joy.[1] This joy is an evidence that we are spiritually alive, and has an eternal quality which no one can take from us. It is a filling station to replenish faith and strengthen character with its confirmation, comfort, and transformation.

(1) Confirmation. Some need the material elements to quicken their faith. Thomas distrusted the abstract report of the resurrection and was unbelieving until Jesus said to him: "Thomas, reach hither thy

communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread." The meaning of Baptism is the simple initiatory rite into one society which should be as wide as humanity; the meaning of the Communion is that all good Christians, whatever their race and whatever their wealth and whatever their position, should meet together on terms of complete equality in that Feast. And no scheme of Christian reunion which does not recognize the necessity that our union must be sacramental can be successful." *The Christian Union Quarterly*, p. 250, April, 1921.

[1] Rev. W. R. Inge, *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion*, p. 63, London, 1924.

finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand and put it into my side; and be not faithless but believing." Thomas' Messianic hope had been buried and could not be quickened, until the Lord spoke, for his spiritual vision had not apprehended the truly imperishable elements in the personality of Christ. But the appearance of the risen Lord gave him a conviction which he did not have before, for if he had had it he would not have doubted. Likewise may the elements say to us, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed," and with confirmed faith and loving recognition may we acclaim with Thomas, "My Lord and my God."

(2) Comfort. While in the Upper Room, surrounded by disheartened followers, our Lord, speaking words of comfort, said, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me." After parting there is a reunion. If you have faith you are in conscious touch with that which is above, and in drawing upon this power you draw the higher power into yourself for strength and counsel.

Remembrance is largely retrospective and engenders faith, which speaks comfort and victory through our relationship to Jesus Christ. For notwithstanding tribulation the Master promised victory, saying, "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

(3) Transformation. The Communion is the place for the hidden man of the heart to hear God speak, and gather strength for new duties. With self-dedication let us build up in us that mind which also was in Christ Jesus. May every thought here be touched with the Master's love, so that the heart may be transfigured to see "Jesus only." The contemplation

of the love and sufferings of Christ, and the joy of the higher fellowship, should fill us with thanksgiving, and call forth a resolution to make our own lives more vicarious.

The Communion appointed for the exhibition and exercise of faith should bring faith and its object face to face. Here we gather strength to crucify selfish and sinful desires, and find encouragement to ascend to the highest plane of purity and holiness, and in the spirit of self-sacrifice imitate the love which was generous towards the whole world, and which would transform us into the image of Him who is our living head, even Jesus Christ. The communion spirit affords a blessed moment, in which the table guests are privileged to "sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:6). May it ever manifest itself by making Jesus the companion of our hearts, and the Supper God's covenant of everlasting love.

THE MEMORY-TIME

(A Convention Communion)[1]

Read Acts 20:4–7; 1 Cor. 11:23–26

Our Convention Communion in some respects is similar to the meeting of Paul and his companions with the disciples at Troas. They were on a journey, and Paul was "hastening," and too hurried to visit the church at Ephesus, yet he tarried seven days at Troas, probably that he might be present at the

[1] Held at Tipi-Wakan (Home of the Great Spirit), Minnetonka, July 4, 1920.

"breaking of bread" on the "first day of the week." Likewise, we have busy men who have business calling them away, but they have tarried for the communion service, for their coming would not be complete without this fellowship. The Convention Communion is somewhat different from the ordinary service in the church, for the Lord's Supper in the local congregation sometimes appears abbreviated and infringed upon by other exigencies; but here as at Troas, the communion should be a deliberate and serene moment, for we come together primarily for the breaking of bread. And should there be any strangers here accustomed to break bread in other communions, we welcome you to our fellowship and remind you that this is the Lord's Table. In the Father's house the children have their place at the table. At Troas Paul preached—he was a master in that art—but it was the disciples that came together to break bread. Paul did not tarry, to break bread *for* but *with* them; and in this service, though the elements are visible, every disciple must break the bread of life for himself.

Though Paul under ordinary circumstances continued his evening service until midnight, it is not unusual in some churches to expedite this service in silence; yet I believe that a thoughtful word (if brief and timely), conveying some single lesson, is always helpful. The one thought that I would underscore to-day is that this is the memory-time. Jesus said, "This do in remembrance of me." The original, I believe, will bear the rendering, "This do for my memorial." At first it may not be apparent that there is any difference between a remembrance and a memorial. Remembrance is subjective, memorial is objec-

tive. Remembrance concerns more especially the individual, and reflects emotions which are personal, intensified perhaps by private experience. But a memorial originates in the concerted action of a church or community, to commemorate some beneficial act or event, deemed worthy to be repeated at intervals to perpetuate gratitude and love. The memory-time has in it the double idea of a remembrance and a memorial. Therefore, to the individual the breaking of bread is for a remembrance, but to the church it is for a memorial.

In this memorial day of the nation it is natural to recall that the Lord's Supper has in it all the essentials of a memorial, viz: (1) Historicity, (2) Institutional character, and (3) And an appeal for periodical celebration for its own perpetuation.

1. Historicity. The Supper reminds us of a memorable event and finished work. It has evidential value, bearing testimony to the distinct and continuous history of Christianity: It argues for a historic Christ, who foresaw his future church and therefore enjoined this celebration before he suffered and died.

2. Its institutional character. The Lord's Supper presupposes a living church and adherence of loyal disciples. As an institution it declares that Christianity is an universal religion, and the church unique and unrivalled by any fraternity or society. It proclaims that all sacrificial religions are set aside by the one great sacrifice of the cross. And as an attestation of the all-sufficiency of that sacrifice, its one theme and gospel is Jesus Christ and him crucified. As an institution it has been a power to preserve

weak churches (and keep them from disbanding), and to strengthen feeble hands.

3. Its appeal for Periodic Celebration that the eye through the elements may reproduce in heart the tragedy of the cross. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." Thus, the Supper is prophetic as well as memorial, and each celebration not only commemorates the price of our salvation, but also provides for the expansion of the Christian religion in the world, and foreshadows the object of our saving faith and inspiring hope. It proclaims the death of Christ as a historic fact, meritorious sacrifice, and assuring hope. Knowing our slowness of heart, our Lord instituted the Supper in order that repeated celebrations[1] might more fully impress his love upon us. Under an old yew tree in Nevern's churchyard, Pembrokeshire, I saw a horizontal marble tombstone eroded through into a hole by the action of the rain descending from the trunk of the tree, drop by drop upon the same spot. Likewise, it is only repeated communions that can penetrate the hardness of our hearts to reach our deepest emotions.

The memory-time brings with it a sense of reverence and worshipful spirit, and worship has in it not only an upward look, but also a purifying endeavor. "Now are we the children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall

[1] It is said that Gladstone "never missed an opportunity of communion. During a mission at Hawarden, after he had turned seventy, he climbed to a church in the cold and darkness of a January morning to communicate with his pitmen at a four o'clock celebration."

see him even as he is. And every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself, even as he is pure."[1]

Then may our partaking of the mementos of his love convey their tender message to our hearts, and prepare us for that purer communion and richer experience at his coming.

THE NIGHT OF THE BETRAYAL

"And it was night," John 13:30

The communion touches our sympathy and love more deeply than any other religious service, because the sacred symbols give silence to discussion and without the machinery of words recall the great tragedy that transcends words. The sacred writers, as a rule, paint no pathetic scenes. Self-contained, they have sternly repressed the painful details of our Lord's betrayal and sufferings. But incidental allusions to his cruel and shameful maltreatment lead us to ask in the words of the prophet Zechariah: "What are these wounds in thine hands?" To which the answer is returned: "Those with which I was wounded in the house of (Israel) my friends."[2] To be "wounded in the house of a friend" was an unexpected and unusual violation of all oriental covenants and hospitality.

The records of our Savior's maltreatment indicate that the concurrence of malevolent circumstances unavoidably increased his sorrow. One of these significant allusions, repeatedly mentioned, is found in the fact that he was betrayed by night. Paul introduces

[1] 1 John 3:2, 3.
[2] Zech. 13:6.

the Lord's Supper by saying that: "The Lord Jesus in the same night in which he was betrayed took bread."[1] In order to emphasize the same fact John distinctly states that Judas "having received the sop went immediately out, and *it was night.*"[2] Our own poet also, assuming that there was something significant in the darkness and tempest of that night, sang:

"Night with ebon pinion brooded o'er the vale,
All around was silent save the night wind's wail,
When Christ, the man of sorrows, in tears, and sweat, and blood,
Prostrate in the garden, raised his voice to God."

However, it is more probable that the passover night had the light of a full moon, as well as the salubrious breeze of a Palestinian climate. Therefore, the betrayal, though full of "the power of darkness," did not gather force from any unfriendly peculiarity of the night, but rather from the mean advantage taken of the night to elude publicity and do work too dark and inhuman for the light and fairness of day. But why was our Lord betrayed on the passover night? He had not been in Jerusalem since the previous December until the passover week. The rulers were afraid to arrest him by day when he was surrounded by friends, and especially "on the feast," because they "feared the people." The passover night was the first night for our Lord to remain in the city, and furnished an opportunity for Judas, who knew some of his movements, to arrest him quietly, and bring him, unknown to the multitude, to the high priest's house. On the passover night, in olden as well as modern time, the streets of all Jewish cities are abso-

[1] 1 Cor. 11:23.
[2] John 13:30.

lutely deserted. All the people by a special custom remain indoors, as their fathers did in Egypt, and not a Jew is seen. Judas with his band could creep through deserted alleys, and in the full paschal moon effect the shameful arrest, and bring Jesus unknown to His midnight trial. Our Lord was probably condemned before His friends in the city were aware of His arrest.

The Savior Himself, who had been daily in the temple, scorned to be arrested at night, with swords and staves as a thief; and alleged that their cowardice had no other resort, saying: "but this is your hour, and the power of darkness."

We deplore that human nature should be guilty of the cowardly cunning which plotted the shameful and brutal arrest of the innocent and sinless One, like a robber in the dead and solemn hours of the night. The betrayal was a contradiction of all outward professions. We grieve to think that a member of the holiest company on earth should forfeit all sacred confidences and consent to become guide to them that took Jesus, after the supper, since eating together,[1] according to oriental custom, was a pledge of friendship and covenant of protection against foes. With the kiss of betrayal he delivered over Him whom he had already sold; and further, crucified all protestations of loyalty in an hour when all the claims of Jesus were disputed, by joining himself to the enemy

[1] "If," says the late Professor Robertson Smith, "I have eaten the smallest morsel of food with a man, I have nothing more to fear from him; 'there is salt between us' and he is bound not only to do me no harm, but to help and defend me as if I were his brother." David Smith, D.D., *The Feast of the Covenant*, p. 64, London.

as a heartless spectator; for it is said: "And Judas also which betrayed him stood with them," continued to stay with them.

The disciples also forgot their pledge and fled. Our Lord predicted this, for He had foreseen that His message and ministry were misunderstood, and that He would be rejected. The communion should be to us a warning against association with the enemy and betrayal, but a pledge of renewed love and loyal service.

But if Jesus were an impostor who was to remain without friends, or followers, it would have been folly to institute a supper to commemorate his own downfall. Our Lord exemplified the truthfulness of His ministry and unfailing love for His people, for when under the shadow of the cross, and overwhelmed by the unspeakable sorrow, shame, and humiliation of Gethsemane, He said to the enemy: "If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way."

The night of the betrayal was the last night of the old covenant, and everything in the paschal celebration was arranged to recall the memorable birth-night of the nation.[1] That was the greatest night in human history, not only because it celebrated the ransom of Israel from imminent death and their emancipation from slavery, but because it was the night of the world's greatest gloom and darkness, and ushered in a new day, for with the day of the new covenant Jesus brought life and immortality to light. While the communion reminds us of the night of the betrayal and the death of the cross, through faith it graciously assures us that the night is over

[1] W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D., *The Lord's Supper*, p. 19, London, 1895.

and that the "Sun of righteousness" is risen, for believers are "the children of light" (John 12:36).

BREAKING OF BREAD

"They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts 2:42).

"Breaking bread" (ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου) was the earliest name by which the Lord's Supper was designated. In the Gospels and Acts it is called by no other name. Breaking bread together then, as well as now, implied intimacy and social favor.

When Jesus employed old customs to serve new purposes the flavor of their former meaning adhered to them. Eating together had always been a mark of high respect in Israel, more so than with us at present, because thereby the guest was brought into the family circle—a sphere of common interest and friendly alliance. Table hospitality brought the stranger into the family worship—a sacred privilege—and made him a recipient of the family blessing, and to some extent a party to the family covenant with God.

The same sacred relationships are perpetuated in a higher degree in the Lord's Supper, and express a spiritual oneness which entitles the whole family to wear the same name (Eph. 3:15).

Though breaking bread was a social custom mentioned in Old Testament time,[1] and in the early ministry of Christ,[2] it acquired a technical meaning as applied to the repasts of the primitive disciples.

[1] Gen. 31:54.

[2] John 6:11; Mark 6:41–42.

Viewed as a Christian rite its two great ideas were sociability and commemoration. Out of the one came the *agape*, and out of the other the Lord's Supper. The Breaking of Bread from the first was detached from the Passover, and was not celebrated annually, but on the first day of every week, or even daily (Acts 2:46; 20:7).

Though the disciples worshiped in the temple, as followers of Christ they were drawn together into a community, and in private ate occasionally their evening meal together, a portion of which was partaken of as a memorial of Christ.

It was easy for such a religious ceremony to become attached to their daily meals, for apart from our Lord's specific request to be remembered, it is thought that the Hebrews never ate meat except in a sacrificial capacity. Recent events so momentous—the Last Supper, the betrayal, crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ—were so vivid in their minds as to engage their whole conversation. Doubtless, when they assembled in familiar upper rooms, and in homes of new converts, they could not refrain from fulfilling the Master's own request of remembering Him in the breaking of bread.[1] Thus the new institution was grafted upon a social meal, and was celebrated with the simple commemorative words of the original tradition, before fixed liturgical forms were framed and elaborated.[2]

The new commandment ("that ye love one another," John 13:34) dominated the social life of the

[1] Norman Fox, D.D., *Christ in the Daily Meal*, p. 74, 1898.

[2] W. F. Skene, *The Lord's Supper and The Passover Ritual*, 1891; and H. B. Swete, D.D., *Church Services and Service-Books*, 1914.

primitive church. This brotherly love furnished the term for love-feast (ἀγάπη) which, as a sacred church entertainment, for a generation or two, preceded the eucharistic memorial. But when the number of the disciples increased the Lord's Supper became dissociated gradually from the ordinary meal and eventually was observed in the church. Finding these church meals abused with excess and by selfish coteries Paul condemned them, and commanded the Corinthians to relieve their hunger at home, for the Lord's Supper is a memorial feast, and not a repast to supply bodily needs.[1]

Perhaps it is as impossible to restore the infancy of the church, with its gatherings from house to house and the charm of their fellowship, as it is to return to our own childhood with its buoyant hopes and innocent pleasures; yet with sincere hearts we can restore the apostolic simplicity and ideals, and by faithful

[1] "In process of time the character of the meal changed. In places like Alexandria it became a social entertainment for the wealthy; in Western Africa and elsewhere a mere dole or distribution to the poor. The Lord's Supper came to be separated from the love-feast, the latter fell into disuse, and in the fourth century its observance in the churches was forbidden." W. T. Davison, M.A., *The Lord's Supper*, p. 62, London, 1895.

"But no sooner had the Church taken root in Gentile soil than the common meal was found to be a source of danger. St. Paul describes the excesses by which it was desecrated at Corinth, and the picture which St. Jude draws is still more discouraging (Jude 12; compare 2 Pet. 2: 13). The *agape* seems nevertheless to have maintained its connexion with the Eucharist in the early years of the second century, for Ignatius of Antioch tells the Church of Smyrna that 'it is not permissible apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold an *agape* (ἀγάπην ποιεῖν),' where the juxtaposition of baptism and the *agape* has been rightly taken to show that the Eucharist was still included in the latter, EP. ad Smyrn. 8 (Bp. Lightfoot's) note." H. B. Swete, D.D., *Church Services and Service-Books*, p. 77, 1914.

adherence to the ordinances and the apostles' doctrine, devoutness of spirit and purity of life, can find God and His peace, and enjoy the aspirations and glad fellowship of the primitive church.

When we come to the Master's table may He find in us that spirit of expectancy and power of recognition which by faith may know Him in the breaking of bread.

"Be known to us in breaking bread
But do not then depart," &c.

LOVE IN THE SUPPER

"Lovest thou me?" John 21:15

The Lord's Supper is an institution of the Savior's love, and intended to be productive of the same in us. Did it ever occur to you that some religious duties demand, to begin with, the very virtue which they are destined to increase and confirm. The sacrificing of Isaac proved both a test of the faith which Abraham already had, and also to increase it, so as to entitle him to become the father of all those who are justified by faith. The same rule applies to the communion. In the Lord's Supper love is the basis of service and the end of the commandment. Love makes our remembrance genuine and acceptable.

In order to make this service pleasing to God and profitable to ourselves, our hearts must be touched by the love which brought our Lord into this world, and which followed Him through life to the memorable closing event, which is so beautifully set forth and commemorated in these emblems. Jesus was full of love, and love always expects to be remembered.

Almost all the commandments of Christ were purely

for the good of His disciples, but that tender request, "This do in remembrance of me," though in no way a selfish petition, indicates that He was not devoid of friendship, nor insensible to the influences and attachments of love. When trouble gathered around Him He desired to be encircled by His friends, saying, "Abide here and watch with me." And the love which made the appeal again framed the excuse, saying, "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. 26:41).

Jesus has endeared himself to us by asking our remembrance. How it would pain us had He come to this world and gone away without making a single request. A friend comes nearer to us by asking a favor, or making a special request of us, for we place ourselves under obligations willingly only to those whom we love, and we reserve our most sacred requests for those whom we love best. To whom does the dying mother confide her parting trust but to the friend whose love and faithfulness have been tried time and again?

In like manner Jesus expects our love before our service, and seems to desire service only of those who love Him; for He said, "Simon Peter, lovest thou me?" and not until assured of his love did He enjoin, "Feed my sheep" (John 21:15–17).

Let this thought come to us now—that Jesus wants us to remember Him in love. Love is more important than remembrance and must precede it to give value to it. It should be the motive power of every service. Love is the fire of every sacrifice, the heart of every remembrance, and the crown of every communion. May these elements now help us to recall the suffer-

ings—yea, the love of Him who loved us unto death; and may the meditations of this hour increase and establish our love, for "it can never be well with us till love that governs heaven itself be the prince of all our actions and our passions."[1] "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren" (1 John 3:14).

Love is the forgetting of self while deeply concerned in another. It is the denying of self so as to sacrifice and give for another.

Oh that we with hearts laden with the Master's love could go home from the table with His remembrance uppermost in our minds, and an unwillingness to turn aside from the sacred memories of His cross.

THREE COMMEMORATIVE TRUTHS

In instituting the Supper our Savior designed that we should commemorate something that would be helpful for us. It is in no way intimated that Jesus desired any commemoration of His personal appearance. We may love to picture to ourselves the form of Him who was "the chiefest among ten thousand," for it is natural to think that a mind so full of truth must have had a countenance as full of grace, that a heart with love so rare must have been accompanied with a form altogether fair. But it has been left to

[1] Jeremy Taylor, *The Worthy Communicant.* Edward E. Hale said: "He was going away; but he could not bear that they should forget him. It was not enough that they should obey him, not enough that they should take his name. They had loved him, and he begged them to love him still; and, though he left them for higher service, he begged them to remember their best friend after he had gone." Lucretia P. Hale, *The Lord's Supper*, p. 7, Boston, 1877.

our faith to draw His outline and finish the portrait with what heavenly light and shade our love can suggest and supply. In the Communion we have an inscription of His heart message, which in the solemnity and sincerity of the occasion impels us to gather up His actions and photograph His visage and love in memory, in colors that will not fade.

What then are we to commemorate? In His discourse at the Table Jesus solemnly viewed the threefold aspect of his death, viz: the *fact*, *manner*, and *design* of it.

1. As often as we come to this table it is ordained that we "show the Lord's death, as a *fact*, till he come."[1] Christ's death was the foundation fact of the gospel. It was the most momentous event in the history of redemption, as attested by its unusual and far-reaching consequences. It not only convulsed nature, "Shook the earth and veiled the sun," but also compelled the Roman centurion and his stern soldiers to confess, "Truly this was the Son of God." The communion in its threefold aspect has evidential value of unimpeachable character for the truth of Christianity. Here is a memorial universally observed by all Christians to-day. Through Christian literature we can trace it step by step back through the centuries, finding no break in its observance amid the fall of old empires and the rise of new nations. "We find it celebrated in Gothic cathedrals, and Roman basilicas, in the hidden passages of the catacombs, and in caves of the African desert, obscure streets of Alexandria, Corinth, and Antioch, until we reach the upper room in Jerusalem where first the

[1] 1 Cor. 11:26.

Memorial was instituted."[1] The rite is a witness whose testimony cannot be confuted to the historic reality of the facts commemorated. It was a historic fact that cannot be disputed. When Jesus said, "It is finished," the old dispensation was closed, the way into the holiest was opened, and heaven became a possibility for every penitent.

2. But our Lord expected also that the *manner* of His death should be a special factor to move the hearts of men, for He said prospectively, "And I if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." The Lord's Supper is not merely a commemoration of His sacrifice. It is also an interpretation of it.[2] "The bread which we break," and the "cup of blessing which we bless," tell of a violent death and cruel torture. If the manner of His death does not touch our sympathy and love we are deficient in human feeling, and have no fellowship with Christ in His sufferings.

3. But to acknowledge the fact and manner of His death, and see no *design* in it, is to miss it all. To deny that there is purpose in the Savior's death is to rob Christ of His love and make His death a mere accident. Had He died for himself His death would have been a martyrdom—but if He died for others—that others might live—He fulfilled the Old and New Testament idea of atonement. That He wished to convey this truth is self-evident, for He said, "This is my body *which is given for you*." And again, "This

[1] J. T. Levens, *Aspects of the Holy Communion*, p. 9, London, 1911.

[2] "He instituted it in order that, as often as we celebrate it, we may not only have His death brought vividly to our remembrance but understand what it means, and realise what blessings it procures and ratifies for believers." David Smith, M.A., *The Pilgrim's Hospice*, p. 63, London, 1906.

is my blood of the new testament shed for many unto remission of sins." "God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "He gave his life a ransom for many," and "bore our sins upon the tree." May we therefore with grateful remembrance commemorate the death of Christ in its threefold aspect, viz., the fact, manner, and design.

HE WAS KNOWN IN THE BREAKING OF BREAD

Luke 24:35

God manifests himself only when the eyes of the heart have been enlightened for spiritual communion, Eph. 1:18. But God's own institutions impart this illuminating grace. The account of the two disciples going to Emmaus, on the Resurrection afternoon, illustrates how the Breaking of Bread is a service of the heart, which is potential for spiritual enlightenment and for inspiring to sacrifice and missionary activity. They were only two ordinary disciples, going to an out-of-the-way place; and so obscure were they that nothing is known of them, save that the name of one was Cleopas, and that the place of their destination was so unimportant that its identity is a matter of dispute.

Yet as they were going "Jesus himself drew near and went with them," and asked, "What communications are these that ye have one with another as ye walk? And they stood still, looking sad." It was a sad day, for their messianic hope was perishing. Cleopas answered, "Dost thou alone sojourn in Jeru-

salem and not know the things which are come to pass there in these days?" He said, "What things?" They answered, the things concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified. And they then add, "But we hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel." Thus were they staggering with doubt! When they could not reconcile the humiliation and sufferings of the cross with their messianic expectations they were disappointed and sad.

When Jesus Himself drew near and went with them, why it was that they could not recognize Him I cannot tell. Death and the resurrection are transformations beyond our experience. There is always a mystery when the finite approaches the Infinite. But their failure to know Him suggests to me that the senses may fail to comprehend and doubt divine realities, when the eyes of the heart may discern with enlightenment and confidence. The outward man changes, but the things of the heart are permanent, and words and deeds emblazon themselves imperishably as ornaments of disposition and character. The eyes of the heart can discern when faith and hope become extinct; for as they walked in the way with despondent thoughts, the old love survived and loved on, and the heart was aglow long before there was an outward recognition of Jesus. "Love never faileth."

How much like to-day was the first Christian Sunday! And how typical of ordinary Christians were those two disciples, for did they not hold to great truths with slumbering faith, and allow disappointed expectations and discouraging events of the day to cloud the sure words of promise, and to sadden their

hearts? They were blind to opportunity, for approached by the Great Companion of the way they nearly allowed Him to go unrecognized. Believers will still be sad, if they count their losses, and forget to count their assets and fall back on the never-failing accessories of thanksgiving and prayer. There may still be sad days, but if not too slow of heart to believe the Scriptures, no day can be too disappointing for the Companion of the way to dispel its gloom and transform it into such joy as to be one of the days of the Son of man.

We know not what duties impelled these two disciples to turn their backs on Jerusalem on that critical day. The gospel may yet call you away from the center of preparation, and from the circle of fraternity, to the neglected and unknown waysides of life, but in obeying the call spiritual longings and unquestioned sincerity will always find Jesus a fellow-traveler. Observe that He did not overtake them; He simply "drew near," showing that He was already on the way.

The Breaking of Bread was instituted to be a heartening service for discouraged disciples in their sadness and disappointments. Jesus foresaw sorrowful hearts going to Emmaus, many discouraged souls despondent by back-sets to some fond hopes, and provided a Table where love may find response to spiritual aspirations. He was known in the Breaking of Bread, and the recognition brought instant satisfaction, and removed every contradiction and doubt. That recognized presence gave new strength for new duties, so that with changed purpose the two obscure disciples immediately became missionaries of

the resurrection gospel. It has ever been that when the heart burns, the sacred fire can maintain itself only by going to kindle other hearts. "They rose up that very hour, and returned to Jerusalem." Ever since the Breaking of Bread is a love-feast, which belongs to the brotherhood of the burning heart. Like those two disciples, every member of this brotherhood is imbued with messianic hope to see in the crucified One Him who "should redeem Israel." May we not forget that when the heart burns with words of remembrance the Great Companion is ever present with his "Peace be unto you."

"O Master, from the mountain side,
Make haste to heal these hearts of pain,
Among these restless throngs abide,
O tread the city's streets again.

"Till sons of men shall learn thy love
And follow where thy feet have trod;
Till glorious from thy heaven above
Shall come the city of our God."

Frank Mason North,
"The Great Companion."

REMEMBRANCE AND IMITATION

"This do"

If in the celebration of Communion we could bring ourselves into responsive sympathy with the dominant idea which possessed the Savior's mind when He instituted the supper, our remembrance would grow from meditation into imitation. I think that He gave us this memorial because He expected us to make it, not an empty remembrance, but the most potent instrumentality for the imitation of Himself.

In giving the disciples these suggestive elements the Savior designed that their remembrance should recall His friendship, and enlist their faith in the message of the kingdom which brought Him to the cross. This remembrance should not be circumscribed by conditions of hasty observance, but should be a moment for thoughtful reflection, and what most naturally grows out of it but imitation, love, and adoration?

Jesus gave us this table as an education to our spiritual nature, but education is largely the fruit of imitation. Why did the Savior just before the Supper wash the disciples' feet, saying, "If I then your Lord and Master have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet" (John 13:14)? Was it to enforce a lesson in humility? Yea, rather a lesson in service and kindness, for as an act of hospitality performed usually by a slave, it was an example in practical service.

Imitation has a work to do upon us. At the point of contact of any two elements there must be similarity of temperature and affinity before fusion takes place. Just so, we cannot be one in Christ unless our remembrance and imitation of Him transform us into his likeness and temperament.

Christ was genuine, and if we imitate Him we cannot be hypocrites, for in order to imitate Him we must observe closely and admiringly that life which was not only full of love and kindness, but also full of trust and truth.

We do not remember Him to-day as we should, unless our remembrance enables us to see Him as He is, and the recognition of His love imparts ardent

desire to imitate Him who "went about doing good." This divine institution appeals to that which is most divine in us, calling us to remember the greatest sacrifice and imitate the noblest ideal.

The art student is drawn by the inspiration of the great masters to the art centers, Paris, Rome, and Athens, in order to catch the spirit and best ideals and achieve perfection in his profession; just so, religion is weak if it hasn't a drawing power and exalting influence.

God has ordained that the best moments and experiences of earth should be preserved to be re-enjoyed in human remembrance and imitation. All through the centuries the best of one age becomes a type for another. Have we not the best of Paradise crystalized in the family? The original bliss of Eden will never be wholly lost, as long as family ties are sanctified by such words as mother and home. And the cross of Christ is not merely a memorial of struggle and resignation; it is also a triumphant sign for imitation, victory, and salvation; for the spirit of the cross imparts enthusiasm for great things, for heroic endeavor, unfailing patience, and untold sacrifice, which enabled the apostle to say, "we are crucified with Christ."

Jesus saw something worthy of being perpetuated and experienced in the Supper, and said, "This do in remembrance of me.[1]" In this monumental institution we have an open door of remembrance, that the

[1] "Nothing that He did are we to omit. Nothing that He did not do are we to add. The thanksgiving, the distributing, the partaking, all this we are to do in remembrance of Him." A. E. Barnes-Lawrence, M.A., *The Holy Communion*, p. 24, London, 1920.

human heart may feel again the heart throbs of Christ's love, the fellowship of the Upper Room, and the confiding assurance of the new covenant, for the reproduction of Christ's life and love in us. Then let this mind be in you which also was in Christ Jesus.

PAUL'S TRADITION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

"I received of the Lord"

In standing at the Lord's table I have often deplored my own spiritual poverty, and regretted my inability to bring a short message from a full heart that would breathe upon your memories the Master's love and peace. But this table was not intended to be a place to express our own experiences, but was ordained to bring us to the experience of our dear Lord on the cross.

Even the apostles in giving us the communion traditions did not attempt to give us their own experiences. When Paul reproved the church at Corinth for its lack of order and disgraceful excesses in the observance of the Lord's Supper, without any allusion to his own experience and sentiments, he simply reminded them of the historical tradition, saying, "For I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you" (1 Cor. 11: 23).

As I view it, this was history, not experience. The language does not necessarily mean that he received it by direct revelation, but rather indirectly through human agencies.[1] But whether directly or indirectly,

[1] Scholars are divided as to whether Paul meant by παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου that he had received the tradition by direct revelation, or by confirmed testimony. Those who believe that he received it through

the tradition undoubtedly was not edited, but transmitted precisely as he received it. This account of the Lord's Supper by Paul is remarkable in that it is older, more full and authentic (as to details) than the parallel accounts in the Synoptics. It is an older writing, for the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written 57 A. D., while the Synoptics are supposed to range from 62 to 70 A. D. It is fuller, and appears to be exactly the form submitted for the guidance of newly organized churches. And preferable in the line of textual criticism, for since Matthew and Mark do not contain the injunction, "This do in remembrance of me," and since Luke's text here is questioned, the stress of evidential credibility rests on Paul's tradition. It is of the greatest importance that the strictest criticism regards this text free from variants and above reproach. Even if not a direct revelation, Paul's account is most authentic, for as regards the Lord's Supper he had had abundant opportunity to receive the testimony and witness the practice of the primitive church. His message comes with the directness of one who had touched the hands of those who touched the hands of Christ when he blessed the bread.[1] He had been the guest of Peter fifteen days,

---

a mediate channel observe that ἀπὸ indicates a remote source, while παρά would have implied more direct communication. Furthermore, it is maintained that παραλαμβάνειν is not usually employed to denote the receiving of anything by revelation. *See* Fr. Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im neuen Testament*, S. 20, Göttingen, 1895.

[1] "Moulton has suggested that Paul was in Jerusalem before the Crucifixion and collected evidence against Jesus, that he had witnessed the death of Christ and that the face he saw on the road to Damascus he had first seen on the cross." A. T. Robertson, M.A., *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research*, p. 74, 1920.

and had enjoyed Christian conference with him on two other occasions. He had been at Jerusalem repeatedly and had visited the oldest churches in their infancy. He had spent a year at Antioch, and varied intervals at other centers, with delegates from the mother church.

Thus, besides being the guest of apostles, he had been the companion of evangelists, such as Barnabas, Barsabas, John Mark, and Silas, all of Jerusalem. Therefore, if he had invented the tradition with the solemn petition, "This do in remembrance of me," primitive Christians and apostles visiting Corinth would have protested and exposed the innovation.[1] If we then take this tradition as history, let us, like Paul, clothe it with the risen Christ, who through His word may breathe the warmth and vitality of His love upon us.

THE FIRST VIEW OF THE CROSS

"Jesus Christ and Him crucified"

How great would have been our loss if we had had but our first communion? Nothing is familiar to us until approached a second time. The table of the Lord brings us repeatedly to the one great event in the life of the Master which helps us to know Jesus

[1] "The doctrine which the New Testament really teaches regarding the Lord's Supper cannot be derived, even collaterally or by way of supplement, from pagan sources; with reference to it, at any rate, it is simply false to say 'that baptism as well as the Lord's Supper already within the books of the New Testament underwent the fateful transformation from symbolic act to *sacramentum efficax.*'" (So Anrich, *Arch. der Strassb. Pastoralkonf.*, 1895, 350f.). Carl Clemen, Ph.D., *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, p. 266, 1912.

Christ, whom to know is life eternal. This knowledge does not consist in a specified information concerning Him, but in a recognition of Him by faith, and an appreciation of Him by the eyes of the heart, transforming the temper of our souls and bringing our wills and His will into harmonious agreement

The weekly communion is not intended to increase our knowledge, but to intensify our love. Increased love does not mean increased knowledge, but a growing appreciation. Appreciative service is the trademark of love; "Hereby know we that we know him if we keep his commandments." If then the knowledge of Jesus and keeping His commandments go hand in hand, no irregular attendance or hasty observance of His ordinances should darken our knowledge.

We need the weekly communion, for by repeated remembrance of our Lord it makes the paths of faith familiar. Calvary, when approached, cannot be surveyed at a single glance. We may need to ascend the *via dolorosa* repeatedly, before we find ourselves in the cross-bearing footsteps of Him who was a man of sorrows. We shall not become acquainted with His grief, like Simon of Cyrene, until by faith we are near His cross, and by sympathy have fellowship with His sufferings. Seldom has the first experience at the Lord's Supper impressed upon any one all the significance of the cross. We may need repeated communions before our hearts are quickened to an appreciative contemplation of either His cup of suffering or our cup of blessing, for we are slow of heart. All who stood at the cross saw the suffering One, but many did not discover until afterwards that the sufferer was a Savior. Some with Thomas have to

see the print of the nails the second time before their love can exclaim, "My Lord and my God."

In all ages what mingled feelings have been awakened by the remembrance of the cross. Some with moistened eyes have failed to take a prolonged look, but have by reflection seen salvation through suffering. Others less sensitive, if not callous, have censured themselves, because their communions have had no more tears for the love that endured all. This is not a tender age, yet it should not be strange if, like Mary Magdalene, some should weep much, having much to be forgiven. May our communions make our hearts rich in the appreciation of Jesus which is the source of all remembrance and gratitude.

THE GUEST CHAMBER

Luke 22: 7–13

We meet here just for a day, but no day is without its record.[1] The last day in our Lord's ministry was but a day; but what a day, in the history of religion, in the unfolding of divine love, and in the enrichment of Christian fellowship. This day too, though not extraordinary, need not pass without becoming a milestone in Christian experience. There is something in the renewed friendships and aspirations of our annual gatherings that re-echoes the fellowship and felicities of the Last Supper. When the day of unleavened bread had come Jesus sent Peter and John to make ready the passover. They were instructed to say to the good man, "The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?" (Luke 22: 11).

[1] Annual Convention of Minnesota Christian Missionary Society.

We do not read the words of institution as authority to celebrate the Lord's Supper, for no one disputes that privilege; but every preliminary reading or talk is merely suggestive. And there is much that is suggestive and instructive in the account of the Last Supper. For as our Communion grew out of the passover, which was a feast of the home, a feast that made every Jewish family a religious family, it raises the question to those present, What is the reaction of the Communion on the home?

In the first place the solemnities of the Last Supper attest that our Lord can enter no upper room without leaving marks of His transforming benediction and grace. There is a tradition that the first Upper Room became the central meeting-place, not only for the meeting on the resurrection night and pentecost, but for all meetings of the primitive church in Jerusalem, and that it was the house of the mother of Mark.[1]

The tradition is supported by the supposition that since Judas knew not the whereabouts of Jesus, after bargaining with the rulers, he naturally would lead the enemy to the Upper Room. The presence of armed men at midnight would throw consternation into the occupants of the house; and it is supposed that a young man aroused out of slumber hastened in his night apparel to warn Jesus of the betrayal. When Jesus was arrested, it is written that "a certain young man followed with him," and when the soldiers attempted "to lay hold on him, he left the linen cloth and fled naked" (Mark 14:52). As Mark alone records this incident, it is supposed that he himself was the young man. That Mark's home was a resort

[1] *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, Vol. ii, p. 789, 1908.

of the infant church is certain, for Peter when released from prison "came to the house of Mary the mother of John, whose surname was Mark" (Acts 12:12). Thus the house was an assembly place of the disciples, and a house of prayer.

But whoever the "good man" was, the accorded hospitality was a wonderful privilege, for thereby he became the last host of our Lord, as well as the first host of the infant church. The solicitation of the guest chamber suggests three things: (a) Jesus Christ expects a prepared feast; "He sent Peter and John, saying, Go and make ready for us the passover." (b) He requires exclusive possession, "When the hour was come, he sat down and the apostles with him." (c) When Jesus is guest the service is transforming. Upper Room became a sanctuary, and the Upper Room as a sanctuary was a new term to religious vocabulary.

(1) In securing the Upper Room the Master has taught that our feast of remembrance should be a prepared communion. But the preparation is of and for the disciples, for "they made ready the passover. The room, table, and dishes were provided by the host, but the materials for the feast were needed—the lamb, the unleavened bread, the wine, and the bitter herbs. The Upper Room was furnished (ἐστρωμένον), literally spread with divans and rugs in oriental festal order.[1] Our communions too often are

[1] "It was a *large* room, though the company was small and needed little space. It was an *upper* room, remote from noise and interruption. It was *furnished*, literally *strewn*, which means that there were coverlets on the couches and rugs on the floor. Mark and Mary gave the Lord their best." David Smith, D.D., *The Feast of the Covenant*, p. 87, London.

matters of routine, with too little forethought to adequately recognize and welcome our Guest. In the passover, the feast of Israel's redemption, the sacrifice sanctified by the temple filled the home with thanksgiving joy and hallel singing. In our preparation, if Jesus becomes a consuming thought, He also will be an abiding presence, to go with us to our homes to perpetuate our communion memories.

(2) Jesus requires undivided possession. Jerusalem in passover time was a city of hospitality, and it was not unusual for more than one passover company to partake in the same apartment; but Jesus required absolute surrender of his guest chamber, for He said, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover *with you* before I suffer." If the householder was a disciple there was something anomalous in his providing a room furnished at his own expense, and still he himself not of the passover company.[1] He heard the Master's voice and the disciples' songs perhaps from another room, as an outsider and stranger in his own house.[2] This expresses the relation of many Christians to Christ. They admit Him into the parlor and library, in their hereditary traditions and religious readings, but they are strangers to the fellowship of the Upper Room. They contribute to the hospitality, but are absent from the feast, and have no living touch with the Lord.

(3) The communion is a transforming service. The

[1] Passover companies were limited to not less than ten and not more than twenty. This passover was a farewell service for Jesus and his apostles; and not even his mother, or any of his many friends from Galilee were allowed to be present.

[2] Oscar Edward Maurer, *The Brotherhood of the Burning Heart*, p. 61, New York, 1913.

guest chamber is the place where the unknown and stranger become friends. Here the Lord who had entered as guest became host. The Son of man who had not where to lay his head, who had no home of his own, became the dispenser of hospitality. He became the house-father of the company, and with Him they eat the bread of life and drink the wine of love. The presence of Jesus will make any place an Upper Room. And in the Upper Room he is ever both guest and host. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me" (Rev. 3:20). Wherever Jesus finds an open door he is present with transforming grace, and the home and its fellowship becomes the prototype of the church and family of God. Where was Christianity from the night of the betrayal until Pentecost but in the home? After the Last Supper Christianity took to the home, and Jesus Christ became the topic of conversation, and the gospel had its resurrection in the breaking of bread from house to house. In like manner, our communions must carry our religion into the home, that the Upper Room may be furnished and ready to visualize and welcome the Master as host and guest.

THE OLD AND THE NEW IN THE SUPPER

"As they were eating Jesus took bread,"
Matt. 26:26

Our Lord commenced his work amongst the Jews, so the religion he preached and the institutions he ordained were rooted in Judaism. As he "came not to destroy but to fulfill," he took their symbols and

conceptions and filled them with new meanings. The scope and purpose of the Lord's Supper then become obvious if we study its component parts.

It is no unusual thing for the history of one religious age to be recorded in its successor; the temple maintained the proportions and internal arrangements of the tabernacle. Religious institutions, also like the geological history of our globe, contain rudimentary traces of previous systems. From Minnesota to Texas we find boulders brought there from the shores of the Canadian lakes in the glacial period. The mountains of ice which carried them here have melted away, but we can learn something of their magnitude by surveying our broad river bottoms, such as the Minnesota valley, great cataracts and wild gorges such as Minnehaha, the vast areas of drift forming innumerable sand hills and thirty thousand lakes in Minnesota, and our gigantic boulders of granite. Traces of iron ore in these boulders point to their northern home.

In like manner we find in the Lord's Supper traces of various passover customs and Jewish conceptions, like so many boulders stranded and stationary. Their presence testifies not only that they are remnants of a previous system, but also that much has disappeared.

If we follow Jesus into the Upper Room we can learn His idea of the Supper if we compare it with the passover which He celebrated: (1) What He omitted; (2) What He incorporated, and (3) What He supplied.

1. What has He omitted? It is apparent from the transition which we find that our Lord did not expect His disciples to keep the passover. It may be ob-

served that He has entirely abolished the national features of the feast and transformed it wholly into a religious rite. Everything pertaining to the history of Israel, such as the memorials of Egypt—the bitter herbs, symbols of compulsory toil and oppression, and the prolonged annual observance of the passover, as a harvest festival—have disappeared. But I shall review the transition only in its religious character:

(1) One of the most marked changes is the abrogation of the Levitical ministry and the renunciation of the sacerdotal administrator. In dispensing with the paschal lamb, the Lord Jesus severed all connection with the temple and the Jewish hierarchy. Before establishing any new clerical order, save the priesthood of believers, He committed the memorial supper to the care of His disciples. Thus by ignoring the traditional ritualistic order, or service, and introducing greater simplicity in worship, our great High Priest has made it possible for every Christian to be his own priest, to intercede for himself.

(2) In selecting the elements of His supper our Lord also has abolished blood sacrifice.[1] The perpetuation of the passover required the blood of a special victim, but Christ suffered once for all, and established a better covenant. Harnack says, "If there is one thing that is certain in the history of religion it is that the death of Christ put an end to all blood sacrifices."[2]

2. What did He incorporate?

(1) Jesus employed the symbolical language and the

[1] He sympathized with the feeling foreshadowed by the old prophets, the giants of the past, Mic. 6: 5–8; Isa. 1: 1, 14, 17; Psa. 40: 6–8.

[2] A. Harnack, *What is Christianity?* 157, London, 1901.

social picture of the passover as old channels to be filled with new meaning and divine grace. Not only the Bread and Wine, but also the Blessing (εὐλογία) and thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) and the closing Hymn indicate how closely the Savior copied the passover pattern. There is a striking similarity between the Supper and the passover in several particulars. Both were for a privileged class, as the Eleusinian mysteries of the Greeks were for the initiated only. As Baptism was the rite of initiation, the Supper is the ordinance of membership, and attests loyalty to God perhaps more than any other act of worship.

(2) The Supper also perpetuated the doctrine of salvation through sacrifice. Though the blood of the paschal lamb procured only temporary security, it undoubtedly implied the forsaking of sin, as symbolized in the putting away of leaven and the ceremonial washing of hands before partaking. The same thought has been developed into the self-examination and moral cleansing incumbent before communion.

The sense of security in God's favor was the special source of *thanksgiving* in the passover, which continued to be the ruling note in the Christian supper and furnished the first extra-biblical name (eucharist) for it.

3. What did it imply? Though the Supper in its origin incorporated much of the passover it has in it enough that is original to constitute a new ordinance.

(1) Christ introducing Himself as the central figure of the feast is the essential and most distinguished feature of the Supper. Here we have the remembrance of a new deliverer and the tokens of a new covenant. With the declaration, "This is my body,"

"This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many," the Lamb of God contrasts Himself with the paschal offering, and substitutes an institution wholly religious for the national memorial. Recognizing that life is in the blood, and desiring his followers to share the joy of His life, He takes its symbol and says, "Drink ye all of it." This exemplifies the spiritual meaning of His words, for no one was allowed to drink of sacrificial blood; and the blood of such victim would be the emblem of death rather than life. The spiritual nature of the Supper also is established on the living character of Christ, whose memory the Supper proclaims until He come again.

(2) The unity of His people in Him. Irrespective of nationality, the partaking of the one loaf, the symbol of His body, implies union in Him. In view of this, Paul said to the Corinthians "we are one loaf in him." In the passover each guest had his own cup, and drank as he pleased, but of the Supper our Lord said, "Drink ye all of it," implying that the cup was lovingly shared by all. The passover was a memorial of mercy, but the Supper is a memorial of love, entailing the power or privilege of communion.

THE CUP OF BLESSING

No one was more familiar than Paul with the history and significance of Jewish institutions. When he said, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" he seems to have passed from the highest point in Hebrew symbolism to the culminating point in Christian experience. The Lord's Supper grows in

sacredness and significance as we consider its history and symbolism. There is an unaccountable enchantment and suggestiveness to the "cup of blessing" which bespeaks its fitness to become the symbol of the "communion of the blood of Christ." In the celebration of the passover, in New Testament time, each person had his individual cup,[1] and there was a "cup of blessing," and its place in the Jewish feast was immediately after eating the paschal lamb, as thanksgiving for redemption.

In seeking a descriptive term for the instrument of the new fellowship the apostle seems to have passed over the historic patriarchal blessings, tender epithets of maternal prayers, pleasing plaudits of Rabbinic lore, and all the memorable benedictions of Jewish worship, to the cup of blessing as transcending all else; for he knew that no service thrilled the Jew with joy like the passover, and the "cup of blessing" after the paschal lamb was eaten was the climax of the feast, as thanksgiving to God for His deliverance and mercy. In the old covenant this cup was a token of joy and gratitude, but now in its new relationship it has become the symbol of spiritual communion and the silent instrument of the highest Christian priv-

---

[1] In the celebration of the Passover, four cups of wine mingled with water were used, (a) The first was the cup of the Kiddusch, drunk with a *Thanksgiving prayer for the day.* (b) The second was the cup of the Haggadah, or *Showing forth* the history of Israel. (c) The third was the cup of blessing, or *Thanksgiving after meal.* (d) The fourth was the cup of the Hallel, or *Blessing of the song, or Psalm.* Authorities are divided as to whether the third or fourth cup was taken by our Lord, and made the cup of the eucharist. As the use of the fourth cup was optional, and as Paul uses the phrase "cup of blessing," there is some probability that it was the third cup.

ilege and experience. But what was its "blessing," and what does this "communion" mean?

(1) According to the Communion traditions of Paul and Luke, this "blessing" was a thanksgiving.[1] The attempt to teach that the "blessing" as consecration was something more than thanksgiving has given rise to an interminable sacramental controversy. There is no intimation in the New Testament that the blessing was more than a thanksgiving. When Jesus took bread and blessed and broke it, it was still distributed as bread. But notwithstanding this, sacramental theories of consecration have built up the classic liturgies. And their sacrificial trend has introduced the altar into the church, for the priest by his solemn consecration is supposed to transform the elements into a real sacrifice.[2] The Mass has always militated against the pulpit and in favor of the altar; but the invocation of the altar without the enlightening ex-

[1] 1 Cor. 11:24; Luke 22:19.

[2] In the Roman Mass the officiating priest after pronouncing the consecrating words elevates the Host for adoration. This act is the climax of service and is impressive to the worshippers. The custom of displaying the sacred gifts to the people before communion prevailed as early as the fifth century, and their elevation by the beginning of the sixth century. But it was not until the age before the Reformation that this elevation was for the purpose of adoration. This practice has resulted in making the Exposition of the Reserved Sacrament and Benediction with it the occasion of popular evening service in Roman Catholic Churches in England even at the present time.

"Processions of the Sacrament are conducted with signs of adoration, and when at the Eucharistic Congress of 1908 such a procession through the Streets of London was forbidden by the Government, the Roman Archbishop of Westminster protested that 'it is not permitted us to carry with us our Divine Master.'" J. T. Levens, M.A., *Aspects of the Holy Communion*, pp. 280, 281, London, 1911.

pounding of the word is not enough to safeguard the church from error.

(2) Communion. Paul interprets the cup together with its blessing as the "communion of the blood of Christ." In its acceptance it symbolizes a vital contact with the blood of Christ, and the solemn remembrance which brings us into sympathy with His sufferings and death. The cup of blessing implies that there is a personality in or behind this symbol to bestow its benefactions and confer its blessings. Therefore it is more than a memorial, for it suggests the significant truth that He who died lives again. As He is risen the cup is an embodiment of His love and presence and the communion becomes the food and refreshment of our souls. It implies fellowship (κοινωνία), not only with the sufferings of Christ, but also joint partnership with the interests of His kingdom.[1] This cup affords individual fellowship because the recipient participates in the symbolical act. And it is the voluntary spiritual act of the recipient that brings him into communion with Christ in the Supper, and into the blessings accruing from His death.

It is the cup of the communion, derived from the word which is translated fellowship, partnership, or to have things in common. Justin, who suffered martyrdom early in the second century, states that in the primitive church the elements were placed before the presiding minister, and after his thanksgiving prayer they were carried around to the assembled communicants by presbyters or deacons. It was not until the

[1] The Greek word (κοινωνία) is translated fellowship which has in it the idea of partnership (from fellow, *felag*, a laying together of property, *fe* property, and *lag*, a laying together, a partnership).

third century that the practice was introduced for each communicant to receive the element singly from the hand of the minister. To recapitulate we may say that the cup of blessing is a Symbol, pledge and channel:

(a) The communion cup is a sign of the new covenant of which Jesus is Mediator, consequently a *symbol* of all gospel benefits. As a memento of the cross it speaks of expiation, fellowship, and sanctification.

(b) It is a *pledge* of equality. In the passover each one had his own cup. But in the Last Supper Jesus received a cup and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves," and they all drank of it. Their drinking of the same cup symbolized their equality and fraternal relationship.

(c) It was also a *channel* for new communion, or approach to the divine presence. For to take the cup by faith is to partake of Christ and receive the blessings of the new covenant. And the great thought of communion is that the risen Savior is companion and comforter.

THANKSGIVING

"And as they were eating Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; This is my body" (Matt. 26: 26).

This was not a blessing *of* the bread, but a blessing *for* it, or a *thanksgiving*; for according to both Luke and Paul, "The Lord Jesus in the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given *thanks*, he brake it, and said, This is my body" (1 Cor.

11:23, 24). And without any change in it, it was distributed as bread after the thanksgiving.[1]

A young woman who had translated some of Batiffol's *L'Agape* for me said: "Somehow I never thought seriously of the importance of the sacrament before. Do you really think that the Savior intended that this should be observed continuously as it is?" I replied, "Well, he said, 'This do in remembrance of me,' and if we accept that, I do not see how we can pretend to be Christians at all if we neglect it."

This incident led me to consider what this institution has in common with all other worship, and I found that its keynote is thanksgiving; and thanksgiving and praise is the natural language of the pious heart in every worship. Thanksgiving implies a grateful feeling and the sincere outward expression

[1] *Sacramental deflections.* If the Church had been mindful that the "blessing" was simply a "thanksgiving," much controversy about transubstantiation and the real presence would have been avoided. But by making the thanksgiving a consecration imparting through the agency of ordained priests some miraculous change or mystical sacredness to the elements unwarranted sacramental doctrines were introduced. Then sacrificial terminology employed at first in a spiritual sense soon acquired grosser conceptions, and the sacrament was called, *oblatio* "offering," *hostia* "the victim," and "the mysteries" in Eastern Liturgies. Thus sacramental efficacy imputed to the elements led to superstitious practices, such as: (1) Reservation of the consecrated bread, by communicants, and by churches. (2) The preserving of the elements at home, in a casket, called *Arca.* (3) Sending the sacrament by the bishop to those absent, and to other churches as a token of brotherhood. (4) It was carried before the pope at a pontifical mass (*Ordo Rom.* 1. c. 8). (5) It was enclosed in altars at the consecration of churches. (6) It was carried on journeys (in Encolpion), and used to avert shipwrecks. (7) It was employed as a charm to cure disease. (8) It was placed in the mouth of the dead. (9) The administration of the Eucharist was one of the forms of ordeal. (10) Finally it culminated in the decree of transubstantiation and doctrine of real presence.

of it. In the history of God's people, thanksgiving preceded every feast and permeated every service. The Lord's Supper was called Thanksgiving, or Eucharist,[1] by the early Christians, for thanksgiving was indispensable to its celebration. Thanksgiving is a loving recognition of God and a grateful remembrance of his benefactions and loving-kindness. The Lord's Supper is a symbolic survey and exhibition of what God has done for us in Christ. The elements are simple, the table unadorned—take away the thanksgiving and the celebration loses one of its essential outward expressions. But if this observance is prompted by genuine thanksgiving it has that which was fundamental to all the Old Testament sacrifices and to all New Testament worship. The amount of thanksgiving is the register of feeling and purpose in every offering.

Ingratitude is one of the most common and worst

[1] The names applied to the Lord's Supper in early times are in themselves important evidence of the out-standing features of the faith and practice of the church. "That it was called 'the Breaking of Bread' proves that this action, as being first, was recognized as the especially characteristic fact in the rite. That it was called 'Eucharist' (εὐχαριστία in Justin i. 66) proves that the giving of thanks was the most characteristic feature of the traditional words. All accounts agree that the acts and words were handed down from the Lord, and not changed or modified by any of the apostles; but there is some disagreement whether Eucharistia or Eulogia was most typical among the words used by the Lord in the Breaking of Bread." Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., *The Expository Times*, p. 249, March, 1910.

The name "Eucharist" was perhaps the most usual designation for the Supper in patristic literature. Justin in describing the observance says, "This partaking is called by us the Eucharist." Irenæus says that after consecration the bread "is no longer common bread, but eucharist." Ignatius says, "They absent themselves from thanksgiving and prayer because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ."

of sins. We require constantly to stir up our souls, and all that is within us to "bless the Lord," "and not forget all his benefits." Those who have been the recipients of timely aid which averted impending destruction are filled with a sense of grateful obligation. I sometimes fear that my heart is a stranger to such thanksgiving as is adequate for the love exemplified in the Lord's Supper. Methinks that if I had known more gratitude the service would impart me a richer blessing. When the fire broke out in the West Hotel, Minneapolis, January 10, 1906, a ladder eighty-five feet long was elevated to the sixth story window, and a pompier extended to the seventh story, and another to the eighth, on which Captain Berwin then heroically ascended to rescue those who between the fire and destruction were clinging to the window. After he had received Mrs. Barlow and begun to descend the lofty ladder, he began to waver and found that it was impossible for him to descend with his charge in safety, so with almost superhuman effort he threw Mrs. Barlow to a place of safety on a balcony, and in the presence of helpless multitudes went down to his own death.

I have thought that one rescued at so great a sacrifice might know what true gratitude means. But the unavoidable catastrophes of life are not worthy to be compared with the voluntary and deliberate sufferings of the cross. God commendeth his own love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. (Rom. 5: 8.) Remembering, therefore, that we are not our own, but were bought with a price, may we make this commemoration a true thanksgiving. (1 Cor. 6: 20.)

IN REMEMBRANCE, NOT IN HONOR, OF HIM

We come to this table to partake of these emblems in memory of Jesus. But what is it to do this in remembrance of Him? Is it simply to do this in honor of Him?

It should mean that, but it means more. To remember is to recall and reproduce the thoughts and feelings inspired by some former event. May we not then, and must we not then, make that event which we did not see as real as if it were present? And must we not bring ourselves face to face with the suffering Savior? I am sure that the cross, the cross and its consequences, is more real to many who look at it across the centuries, than it was to some of those who even drove the nails.

We are commanded to do this in remembrance, and not in honor, of Him. You can honor a man by proxy. In European countries it is customary when a distinguished man dies for dignitaries to honor his memory by sending a representative to the funeral. But we do not come here to pay homage to the memory of Jesus; we come to remember Him in His death, and to testify our loyalty to Him as disciples, a service that no one can do for us. In our remembrance we should be determined not to know anything save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. (1 Cor. 2 : 2.)

All who come to this table are the friends of Jesus, and claim kinship to Him who said to His disciples, "I have called you friends," to Him who hath laid claim to the supremacy of love, in that He laid down His life for His friends. To do this in remembrance of Him is not only to recall the inhuman cruelty of His cross, but to feel the love which linked His infinite

compassion to our utter helplessness. The spirit of true remembrance would give Him the best place in our hearts, and make this table show forth His death as a sacrifice of love. What sacred memories cluster around the Savior's closing hours!

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER

The Lord's Supper reminds us of the most significant event in the life of our Savior. Christ's death was the world's greatest sacrifice. It was the greatest fact in human history and also the greatest factor in the history of human redemption. Without it the Old Testament would be without fulfillment, and the New without significance and ratification.

Paul would have us believe that Jesus not only fulfilled the types and shadows, but replaced them with nobler truths and blessings, for he says: "For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ; wherefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. 5:7, 8).

If Jesus is the Christian's paschal lamb we must view Him in the light of the Jewish passover (πάσχα) which served a threefold purpose. (a) It commemorated Israel's deliverance from bondage, and from the destroying angel in Egypt. Therefore, it was the anniversary of the nation's birth. To recall births or beginnings, such as the beginning of a family or birth of a nation, was always a joyous celebration. (b) The blood of the first paschal lamb was a sign rather than a substitute when placed on the door-posts by divine appointment to ward off the destroying angel. It was

a token of faith, and in the development of worship served as an atonement for the sins of the people, and proved a shadow of good things to come, pointing unmistakably to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.

(c) It served as a worship with its burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, and joyful and patriotic appointments. Thus patriotism ended in thanksgiving, and the historic anniversary in divine worship and national celebration. What patriotism and gratitude it awoke yearly to recall the birth of their nation. It was divine Fourth of July, celebrated in God's appointed way. The lamb without blemish and without spot was slain, but not a bone was broken, and in this it prefigured Christ our passover, by the shedding of whose blood believers, God's first-born, are delivered from sin and death.

The passover terminated bondage and inaugurated freedom. It meant farewell to Pharaoh and Egypt, and marching through Emmanuel's land with faith in God.

The strength of religion and its rites is in its purifying power and bearing on life and its motives. The casting out of the old leaven implied that the people of God must abandon sin and corruption, and keeping the feast with sincerity and truth meant that the Supper imposed loyal convictions and moral or righteous ideals.

THE CUP OF THE KINGDOM

"This cup is the new covenant in my blood"

We have in Luke 22: 15–20 a double parallel of the Last Supper, in which the *eating* and *drinking* of

verses 16–18 are balanced by the *loaf* and *cup* of verses 19–20. The Western text in omitting verses 19b, 20 is unusual, and leaves the parallel incomplete. It gives the *eating* (v. 16), and *drinking* (v. 18), and the *bread* (v. 19a), but omits the institutional words, "which is given for you; This do in remembrance of me" (v. 19b), and the eucharistic, or second *cup* (v. 20), all essential to the new covenant. The *eating* (v. 16), and the first *cup* (v. 17), apparently belonged to the paschal supper; but the second *cup* (v. 20) was "after supper," or the paschal meal. Thus Luke in giving the first member of the parallel (16–18) connects the Lord's Supper with the Passover as no other writer, and by his complete report emphasized the social as well as the memorial side of the Last Supper. Luke has given more place to the social and fraternal side of Christianity than any other New Testament writer. He also is the only one to record our Master's ante-communion bequest, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" (Luke 22:29). According to Luke 22:24 this was said at the time of the feet-washing (John 13:4) which took place in the early part of the paschal service.

That passover was the last of the old dispensation; its cup, covenant, and fellowship were old; but like all divine institutions it was not to pass away until fulfilled—fulfilled by a cup of a new covenant in a new kingdom. It was the passover and not the eucharist of which the prediction was made, "I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God," for as yet the Lord's Supper had had no existence. But I take

it that the cup of the new covenant immediately following was the *sigillum* of the kingdom, consequently the fulfillment was eucharistical and not eschatological.[1] Since the bread and wine were instruments of the new covenant the "fulfillment" was an immediate consummation, and not a metaphor of some cataclysm postponed to distant millenniums, for consistent with the Messianic hope, the kingdom which was not of this world was already here, for the next day Jesus conceded that He was a king (John 18: 37). The higher hopes of the Church culminate in Jesus Christ. And while other things change, the kingdom of God is still righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 14: 17); doubtless it was such in the Upper Room, and has been ever since, whenever Christ is present in loving hearts.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE KINGDOM

"Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness"

When we come to the Lord's Table is it not true that we renew the spirit that possessed us at our baptism, and that both sacraments voice the same appeal for righteousness? As a Christian institution, baptism is regarded initiatory, and the Lord's Supper, the ordinance for professed believers, a memorial; in military parlance the one representing official enlistment, and the other loyalty of service. But as Christian sacraments have they not an inner meaning in common, which makes them more than initiatory and memorial rites? Are they not the harbingers of righteousness?

[1] By transposing "until that day," after the words of institution, Mark 14: 25 and Matt. 26: 29 have given the prediction an eschatalogical coloring not supported by Luke.

When Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan to be baptized, John objected, saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" As much as to say, "You are my superior in consecration, and as administrator you can make this rite confer some grace mystically upon me." Jesus declined, and in His response clarified the meaning of baptism.

I am not sure but that John, under the influence of sacerdotal training, declined to officiate, because he supposed that the validity of the rite depended upon the sanctity of the celebrant, for he said, "And comest thou to me?" We still have those who hold the same idea, and think that the consecration of the priest is conducive to the impartation of some mysterious vicarious grace. Therefore, when a distinguished prelate comes on a visit he must be asked to celebrate "Holy Communion." And one of the earliest official acts of a new Pope is to celebrate mass, and give his blessing.

But Jesus dissuaded John and showed him that he was all wrong. But, though John acknowledged his imperfection, if all celebrants were required to equal John's consecration before officiating, it is doubtful that we would have any valid baptism or worthy communion to-day. John, conscious of his inferiority, said, "I have need to be baptized of thee," as if expecting thereby to catch some of the righteousness of Jesus. When Jesus showed him that the requirements and advantages of baptism are for the penitent candidate and not for the baptizer, and approved the spiritual import of his mission, John gave in.

But what is baptism, and is it "*for*" or "*unto*" the remission of sins? The baptism of John apparently

was of divine appointment (John 1:33), and as such a public transaction between man and God, to make the life (as far as possible) to tally with righteousness in preparation for the kingdom. Jesus made John understand that baptism, with its prospective obligations, is not *for* the remission of sins, as a bonus; but as the culminating act of faith and repentance, involving the breaking with sin and righting of conduct, a provision "*unto* the remission of sins." But why baptize in water? Because ceremonially the rite announced the beginning of a campaign of self-purification. The coming of the Messiah had been promised "to bring in everlasting righteousness" (Dan. 9:24). And since the coming of the Messiah called for righteousness as the keynote, should not the ideals of Christian service give equal spiritual prominence to it, as does baptism to "the answering of a good conscience towards God?" For it is self-evident that we cannot preach baptism unto the remission of sins without preaching baptism for the "fulfillment of all righteousness."

The remembrance of Jesus Christ as we surround His Table inspires square and honorable dealings, and is an open declaration that we stand for righteousness. Righteous and true are thy ways, thou King of the ages. Seek ye first the kingdom of God.

CHRIST'S DIVINITY IN THE SUPPER

Christians of all conditions have always found the communion helpful, because they find in it the tenderness and fortitude, the resignation and strength of Christ. Every thought here brings into relief the simplicity of the means, and the majesty of the agent,

so that the soul finds under the semblance of human sympathy the very consolations of divine love.

As the Old Testament saint laid hold of the horns of the altar for safety, so there are moments when the heart seeks security in the most abiding and fundamental thing in Christianity. As a higher critic, it dispenses with everything weak and temporal, and seeks to rest wholly on the grace of the strong Son of God who bore our pain.

There is much that is akin to our way of human thinking in the memory of the Upper Room, where Jesus in the attitude of the human host and loving friend washed the disciples' feet; but the elements speak peace to our souls, because behind and beyond the human friendship, our inner aspirations find the love and sympathy of the divine "Christ of God." It is Christ's divinity that makes the communion service at all permissible and significant. We would recoil from commemorating in this way any mere man, or religious prophet, be he never so great or good.

A soul struggling with sin seeks in communion, not the memory or approval of a sinless man, but the fellowship of the ever-living and ever-present compassionate Christ. "No one who has felt the heavy weight of sin, the painful accusations of a wounded conscience and the oppressive anticipations of coming retribution,"[1] could for a moment have any regard for communion, if it rested only on human authority and commemorated only a human teacher.

The language and observance of the first Supper are wholly inappropriate for any human origin, but

[1] Howard Crosby, *At the Lord's Table*, p. 36, New York, 1893.

quite consistent with our Lord's exalted character, and in several particulars exemplify His divinity. For He had power (a) to forgive sins, (b) to give life, and (c) to live a sinless life on earth. In proof of this reference may be made to

1. His prophetic utterances.[1]

(a) He predicted explicitly His own violent death—a prediction which would have nullified the communion and made the cross of none effect had it miscarried.

(b) He did unmistakably foresee His future church and proclaimed Himself its Lord; as expressed by Paul, "As oft as ye (the church) eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's (crucified and risen) death till he come."

2. His own estimate of His death.

(a) In pouring out the emblem of His blood He

[1] "That the rite implies a clear foresight on the part of Jesus of the fact and mode of His death, and its ultimate effect upon His followers and the world—is undeniable. . . . Recall the six accounts of the three separate occasions on which He is represented as explicitly foretelling His fate; recall the five instances in which, on at least three different times, He is reported to have bidden every one that would follow Him to take up His cross; remember His answer to the inquiry about fasting—"the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast in that day"; picture again the scene on the Mount of Transfiguration—where Moses and Elijah spake of His decease which was to be accomplished in Jerusalem; consider the treatment of the 'one beloved son' (Mark 12) in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen; call to mind His chilling reply to the ambitious brothers: 'Are ye able to drink the cup I drink,' " etc.; His likening of His end to that of Jonah, and that which the Baptist had but recently met (Matt. 17: 12). . . . In short, read any of the Gospels, and see what a torso it becomes on the supposition that the references to the crucifixion are afterthoughts that have been crowded back into the story." Prof. J. Henry Thayer, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, pp. 110–131.

showed that His mission was worth His life, and in declaring it "Shed for many for remission of sins" showed it to be more than human sacrifice. He professed power to forgive sins, and "Who can forgive sins but God alone?" (Luke 5:21.) The spirit that was in Him was the Spirit of God, and His achievements were the work of God.

(b) He made Himself the passover of His people; and by a new testament made Himself the mediator of the new covenant (Heb. 9:15).

3. The Christ of the Communion is a divine Comforter. In the presence of death, where usually the pretensions of a lifetime are abandoned, He was the same only-begotten Son of God, and gave even then no antidote for sin save Himself (John 6:33, 48–57).

This table is a tribute of love to Him through whom every prayer ascends, and in whose name every blessing descends. The Lord's Supper in the church has always been a recognition of Him who is head over all to the church.

While the Bible has never advocated any special theory of atonement, it has always clothed our Lord with sufficient divinity to be the Savior of the church (1 Tim. 2:3). "Men have found in Him their ideal for human life, and they have regarded Him as the concrete embodiment of their highest thought of God. These values have been formally expressed in the doctrine of His perfect humanity on the one hand and His absolute deity on the other."[1]

The church below as well as the church above will worship Him, and will continue to say, "Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints" (Rev. 15:3).

[1] Shirley Jackson Case, *The Historicity of Jesus*, p. 341, Chicago, 1912.

CHRIST'S HUMANITY IN THE SUPPER

"Jesus wept"

This table brings Jesus nigh to us in all the helpfulness and kindliness of His character, that we may remember how qualified He is to comfort and help us. We often speak of the assurance which Christ's divine nature imparts, but fail to emphasize the compassion which His human nature warrants, lest some one will say that we believe in His humanity only. When Jesus instituted the Supper, he said, "This is my body," as if He desired especially that we should not forget His humanity. There is a touch of our human feelings and human friendship in the request, "This do in remembrance of me." He did not give us this institution as a memorial of His miracles, His life, or His divine nature, but to enable us to recall His mission upon earth and to remember how His body was treated. The emblems (of His body and of His blood) commemorate Him in the flesh.[1] By faith He is incarnate here; He is truly our brother here, "for we have not an high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." There are many who will show an outburst of sympathy when accidents befall us, but our high priest is a provision for our individual infirmities, the unfortunate weaknesses (ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν) that continually hamper us. Christ's human nature becomes our new ground of confidence, for though all agree-

[1] "σῶμά μου cannot mean the Church; for by the blood we must certainly understand the shed blood—therefore also by the body we must understand not the mystical body, but the one given up to death." Carl Clemen, Ph.D., D.D., *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, p. 246, Edinburgh, 1912.

ments, official connections, and even earthly priesthood terminate in death, He who hath passed through the heavens as the Son of God became, not only our high priest forever to intercede for us, but also our sovereign forever to preside over us as our interested benefactor and brother.

Moses E. Lard used to say that he loved to think of our Lord in relation to our human nature, and remember Him as the carpenter's son, "playing with the shavings which Joseph's plane did make." There is truly a gratification in the thought that He shared our experience, in the playfulness of youth, in the attachments of friendship, and in the struggles and disappointments of life. The poverty of Nazareth, as well as the divine abundance, contribute to the enrichment of the inheritance of the saints, "being tempted he is able to succor them that are tempted" (Heb. 2:18).

But why did He wish us to remember Him in His human nature? Because without the flesh there could be no brotherhood. Without the flesh He could not be our brother. Without His body there would have been no Calvary, and without His love there would have been no communion or fellowship. His humanity was His badge of service and helpfulness, which enabled His pity and love to become tangible. I cannot think of His human nature without remembering His friendship, kindness, and tender sympathy, without remembering that Jesus wept—wept human tears, expressing divine compassion. It is difficult to associate the idea of friendship and companionship with the Father, but Christ in His human nature is a part of our very selves. He formed social attach-

ments as we do, He loved as we love, He sympathized as we sympathize, and comforted those in trouble as the heavenly Son of Man only could.

But though apparently human, His love and sympathy, like the sun, shine from heavenly heights. Our old human nature in Him has become expressive of thoughts and deeds intensified with divine power and divine compassion. What gratitude we owe for the Word made flesh (John 1:14). In Him God speaks to the heart of the world, and appeals to all that is best in our own hearts.

THE BREAD OF LIFE

Prayer and the Lord's Supper are devotional exercises, yet a critical inquiry into their nature and place in worship occasionally may strengthen our faith. The desire to avoid the controversial side of the communion deters us from discussing some of the profoundest and most characteristic sayings of Jesus; yet a people practising weekly communion should be conversant with every phase of the ordinance.

The day after the five thousand were fed with the five barley loaves and two fishes at the Sea of Tiberias —at the very time when the highways were thronged with the men of Galilee journeying up to Jerusalem to the passover—Jesus under the promptings of both these events said to those in the synagogue at Capernaum, "I am the bread of life."

Catholic and Protestant differ in their interpretation of this verse, and as to the means of verifying its truth; but they are nearer in their experiences than in their theories, for both agree that Christ is the bread of life. Though our Savior reproved those

who desired to turn His miraculous power into personal gain, and would follow Him for the material bread, there are still those in our time who cling to the literal interpretation of His words, and think that the bread of life may be present in the communion in a material form. They are led to this conclusion partly, perhaps, because Jesus said: "The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have not life in yourselves." But this is fulfilled in appropriating the benefits accruing from His crucifixion rather than from the communion; for who would presume to say: Except ye partake of the communion ye have not life in you?

This discourse on the bread of life was delivered a year before the Lord's Supper was instituted, and those addressed in the synagogue had never heard of a communion, and were far from being model or worthy communicants. Christ nowhere implied that His body was material bread, but the bread of life is that bread which came down from heaven, whence His physical body came not.

Still more, as if to preclude any literal interpretation of His words, our Savior, knowing the murmurs of the Jews and the perplexity of the disciples, said, "The flesh profiteth nothing, the words I have spoken unto you they are spirit and they are life," implying that His words and acts constitute the bread of life, of which it was incumbent to eat while He was still in the flesh.

What then does it mean to eat the bread of life? It is a figurative expression indicating a work of faith which has no exact external counterpart in any reli-

gious act or ceremony. Jesus asserts that as the one who supports, nourishes and satisfies the soul He is the bread of life. The heart has hungerings which no bread can satisfy save Jesus; for He alone can speak peace to the guilty conscience, and give assurance and rest to the troubled soul.

Prophecy, type, and symbol mature like golden grain to assume in Christ their final form as the bread of life—"The salvation of the Lord, the strength of our faith, the joy of our hope, and the life of our love."[1]

But if we come to this table with our hearts far from God, we shall find no bread of life here. Christ is associated less with the material bread than with the living faith. It has been remarked that we do not find Him *on* but *at* the table, not *in* the elements but *in* our confiding hearts.

If it were essential to eat the bread of life while He was here in the body, it is no less incumbent while He is not here in the flesh. But we eat the bread of life now, not because we partake of the communion bread, but because this memorial is an incentive to our hearts to seek the grace which makes us rich, think Christ's thought, and feel in *receiving*, in a measure, the spirit which filled Him while *giving* Himself for the life of the world.

He is the bread of life, not exclusively in the Lord's Supper, but wherever we find Him, confirming His promises, and wholly satisfying our admiring souls. While expecting the bread of life in other religious exercises, such as prayer and praise, we must seek it especially in this ordinance. The bread of life is the joy of this feast. At this table our Lord delights to

[1] A. Campbell, *The Millennial Harbinger, Extra*, p. 69, 1830.

satisfy the poor of Zion with bread. In His house there is bread enough and to spare and from His heart compassion flows.

Were we constrained to recall God's most gracious manifestations to us, where with Israel would we locate our Bethel? Could we not invoke Him as the God of our communion memories, the Dispenser of the Bread of Life? In the despair of our own insufficiency there is none save Jesus to whom we may go, so with Peter we may say, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." And as the Bread of Life He is the all-essential of our best hopes. The communion bread reminds us of that bread which cometh down out of heaven and giveth life unto the world. And the table fellowship commemorates that sacrifice which is the basis of our forgiveness, and the assurance that that which became mortal through sin may live again. Therefore, with greater faith and better knowledge than that of the Jews, may it be the prayer of every communicant, "Lord, evermore give us this bread" (John 6:34).

THE LORD'S SUPPER AN INTERPRETATION

"This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28).

Our Lord in this solemn announcement does not refer to the manner of His death, but to its similarity to the paschal sacrifice. He does not allude to the shedding of His blood in crucifixion, which was not looked upon then as means of expiation, but contrasts the pouring out of His own blood in a sacrificial manner with that of the paschal lamb, which

lies before them, and whose blood had been poured out at the altar of burnt offering.[1] In contrast to the lamb which was slain for a family or company, and formed only limited, temporal, and imperfect expiation, Christ offered Himself "for many"—an indefinite number. Thus in giving "his life a ransom for many" He implied a general, complete, and permanent satisfaction. While Jesus approved of the practice of almsgiving, praying, and fasting of His time, He gave no encouragement to sacrificial worship, and spoke of the efficacy of no blood save His own.[2] Jesus in the Supper represents Himself as already dead, and His blood as the ground of forgiveness and the seal of the redemption covenant.

Every one who came to the altar confessed his sin by the very sacrifice which he brought as an atonement. Likewise our acceptance of the Lord's Supper implies acknowledgment of guilt and reliance upon the reconciliation in Christ. Since Christ offered Himself "once for all," the table is no longer an altar, nor the communion a sacrifice.[3] The elements are memorials of Him as already slain. In them He is not palpable to the hand but present to the heart.

[1] (ἐκχυννόμενον) "being poured out," is better than "shed," and is so rendered by the Revisers in Luke 22:20. The verb ἐκχέω is repeatedly employed in Old Testament where the sacrificial blood was poured out at the base of the altar, *see* Lev. 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34.

[2] In Matt. 5:23, 24 Jesus emphasizes the essential spirit of worship. He then recognized sacrificial worship, but placed the emphasis on conduct.

[3] In the communion Hooker observed that Christ is present in the heart, and not in the hand, "called down out of heaven at the bidding of some priest, and passing through the mouth under the veil of bread and wine." J. J. S. Perowne, D.D., *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, p. x, 1898.

The efficient cause of remission is not the drinking of the cup, but the pouring out of His blood. Remission is the basis of spiritual life, but the Supper presumes that the guests who are nourished by it have been already forgiven.

Alexander Campbell was asked: "Does not the Christian in partaking of the Supper, in a proper spirit, and understanding its nature and design as really receive the remission of his sins as the penitent alien in baptism?" He answered: "For those in the Messiah's kingdom there is no ordinance of remission except the ordinance of repentance and confession. The Lord's Supper is emblematic of the Messiah's sacrifice, and commemorative of His death, and is to us a weekly memento that our sins have been expiated by His blood."[1] Notwithstanding the Roman Catholic declaration,[2] partaking of the Lord's Supper is not set forth as a condition of pardon, by either the New Testament or the early Church. As it testifies of a full reconciliation, it partakes largely of thanksgiving. Jesus lays full claim to the expiating character of His death.[3] Blood has been always the covenant sign of forgiveness and acceptance, and the communion cup perpetuates the covenant of redemption (Heb. 9: 19–22).

---

[1] *Millennial Harbinger*, p. 396, 1846.

[2] "The principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins." *Council Trent*, Sess. xiii, October 11, 1551.

[3] "The words of Christ in John 6: 48–58 and at the Last Supper, and the reference to the Supper by St. Paul, will be to us an enigma incapable of solution unless we read them in the light of the abundant and clear teaching of St. Paul and the other sacred writers, and of our Lord Himself, about the connection between His death and our salvation." Joseph Agar Beet, *The Lord's Supper* (Symposium), p. 173.

Our Lord's solemn announcement in the face of impending death that His blood was poured out for the remission of sins is to us the highest proof of His power and deity. The power to forgive is greater than that of miracle-working, and belongs to God alone. The prophets could perform miracles, but who can forgive sins save God alone? (Luke 5:21.) While all the sacrifices were inadequate to expiate one sin, "the Lamb of God" "cleanseth us from all sin."

BIBLE MEMORIALS

The Christian Church has three Bible memorials: (a) The Lord's Supper, (b) Baptism, and (c) The Lord's Day, commemorating or symbolizing respectively the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord.

The Lord's Supper as a memorial of our Lord's death addresses itself to the heart rather than to the head. The sermon appeals largely to the intellect, but the communion has a tenderness and sacredness peculiarly its own, for it carries us to Calvary, "where the cross of salvation was raised and the blood of a Redeemer fell."

The Breaking of Bread is a monument of Christ's love, and monuments are based on history, and emphasize some particular fact or event to reproduce and embody the spirit and life which they commemorate, and aim to make permanent the love which designed them.

In giving us the Communion Christ has not only drawn us very near to Himself, and brought us into the inner court of His kingdom, that we may know His heart and enjoy the blessings and experiences of His fellowship, but He has also partaken of our

thoughts and feelings and viewed His own departure from our human standpoint. Jesus was accustomed to place Himself on the human side and to bear the burden of those in trouble. With the bereaved family of Bethany "Jesus wept." Likewise, in arranging the Last Supper, with its concluding farewell discourse and touching exhortation to the disciples, we see something more than the dying concerned in the consolation of the living, for He anticipated the feelings of His people in all ages, and consequently instituted a memorial that their hearts might express gratitude, and proclaim the hope of His second coming: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." He did not want our hearts to be left with nothing but utter loneliness, consequently He designed that memory should find a companion in His love.

We have here then the monument which Christ Himself selected, but it remains for your own heart to complete the inscription according to the measure of your gratitude. Some monuments impress us by their design, others by the inscriptions they bear. But all monuments are consecrations of love and gratitude. Nelson's Monument, in Trafalgar Square, London, bearing the inscription, "England (to-day) expects every man to do his duty," is a splendid column, about one hundred and fifty feet high. For its majestic beauty every Englishman might feel proud of it. But I saw a less pretentious stone in an old churchyard at Brynberian, in memory of a father and mother, with a single sentence, which formed a greater monument, viz., "Loved the most by those who knew them best."

That expresses very nearly the thought of the Communion, for love is also its message. Like that monument, this Table tells of one who is loved by all who truly know Him, and loved the most by those who live nearest to Him.

THE COMMUNION PEACE

At the Last Supper our Savior said to His disciples, "My peace I give unto you."[1] If there is ever a moment in which the worry and fret which ruffle our peace should cease it should be here at the Lord's Table, where God's peace like a mellow light fills and warms our souls. Christ in the hour of communion ordained peace for His people, and expressed a desire that our everyday life should share the tranquillity of this hour.

For those distressed in soul there is nothing so precious as the peace of God. Our Lord promised peace for His people, because He was going home and knew that there is nothing that makes earth so much like heaven as perfect peace.

At the close of the Jewish passover the presiding officer was accustomed to relate what the life of God's people had been. In lieu of this, Jesus delivered His after-communion discourse. Turning away from the pride and patriotism of the race, He encouraged the disciples to look for better things to come, and fortified their hearts against tribulation with a bequest of peace, saying: "These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."[2]

[1] John 14: 27. [2] John 16: 33.

In thus both predicting tribulation and promising peace there was no contradiction, for Christ gave no promise of external peace. Many of the early Christians had nothing outwardly but tribulation—outwardly the world was unfriendly, but the Lord gave them peace within. Our Savior knew that in all ages His disciples could not escape temporal tribulation, nor the usual struggle for existence, but He knew also that if there are no inward contradictions and no hidden shame lurking in the heart, there is peace within and all clear and light Godward.

Christ invites us to enjoy the peace of His own life and in a measure the blessedness of His own communion experience. What then was our Savior's communion life, and the peace to which we should attain? Though His heart was heavy and exceeding sorrowful with a burden not His own, in the contemplation of His own inner life He was serene and full of peace. There were innocence, love, and peace within, and nothing but goodwill to the world without. His was a life in which there were no bitter regrets, painful memories, nor a tumultuous conscience. His life was rich in love and benedictions, and He enjoyed peace unsullied by sin. This world purified from sin would be a very acceptable and peaceable habitation. Jesus designed that it should be so for us; for the two great sacraments of Christianity, for those who understand the spirit of the gospel, are tokens of the "remission of sins," and freedom from sin implies a conscience void of offense and peace with God.

There is peace when the soul is in harmony with God's purposes. Christ's promised peace implies that

Christ's spirit is still in the world and capable of making Christ's love the ruling passion of our hearts.

EASTER

"He is risen," Mark 16:6

The celebration of the Lord's Supper on Easter is a fitting service with which to express the thought and love of the Christian world. Even if we (the Disciples of Christ) do not view this day exactly as our religious neighbors, as a church festival, we are susceptible to similar spiritual influences which with harmonious seasons intensify religious thought and devotion.

After a season of self-restraint and self-preparation there are thousands in all parts of the world who are patiently expecting richer experiences and closer communion with God to-day. The religious world arises from a study of its own heart, partaking somewhat of that humbleness of spirit which would say, "Lord, be merciful to me a sinner," and is looking upward, seeking by faith and prayer to place Him, who is the resurrection and the life, uppermost in every believing heart to-day. The resurrection recalls the cruel sufferings of the crucifixion. Calvary and the Aramathean sepulchre were not far apart, so the universal church now seeks to reflect in its communion the solemn shadow of the cross, and in its Easter flowers and inspiring music the joy and triumph of our Lord's resurrection.

It may not be easy nor consistent for us, who commemorate our Lord's death every week, who honor His resurrection by the observance of every Lord's day, to impart to this day the character of a yearly

festival. The New Testament church knows specifically no church festivals. But we would not have this communion be less rich in faith, less fruitful in love, or less suggestive in the memory of our Lord, than that of those who have only an annual festival. This day is a valuable historic landmark. Anniversaries express and emphasize some monumental truth, and perpetuate the love and loyal remembrance of their object.

There are times when the human heart, like the face of nature, drinketh in more readily the dew of heaven and respondeth thereunto more refreshingly than at other times. In our reception of blessings our acknowledgment should be as faithful as that of the earth on which we move; "The rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater."[1]

Special seasons should call forth increased progress, and every climax in the Christian life should reach to a higher level. Our devout remembrance to-day will go for little unless it will impart to us more of the abiding presence of Christ. The memory of the cross and the lessons of the resurrection should make us more patient in the face of provocation, more persevering in the face of discouragements, and more Christlike in the pursuits of life during the week.

If in our remembrance we would "Crown Him Lord of all" to-day, let Him be the Lord of our hearts to-morrow and the day following.

---

[1] Isa. 55: 10.

THE LORD IS RISEN INDEED

Dominus illuminatio mea, Psa. 27: 1

Sacred memories make sacred times. The memories that cluster around the Lord's table are quite in harmony with the central thought of this Easter day. To-day is the anniversary of Christ's resurrection. The Easter lilies and Easter music do not say as plainly as our Christian communion does, "The Lord is risen indeed."

The pictorial and ornamental attachments for this day are not equal to this ordinance, which has come down through the ages to remind us of the dominating thought of the first Christian Easter. Communicants after a season of self-preparation, self-denial, and devout meditation have anticipated special refreshing experiences to-day at the Lord's table.

Christ's resurrection is the guarantee of all Christian hope. The announcement of the angel at the empty sepulchre, "He is risen," was the gladdest message this world ever heard. The resurrection of Christ substantiated His claims and made the hope of immortality possible and desirable.

Without the resurrection of Christ the Bible would be no more than any other good book. Without the resurrection the church would be without the power and assurance of salvation, and the ordinances would be meaningless ceremonies.

On this day this table reminds us of the cross and the overwhelming proofs of the resurrection. The witnesses of the resurrection become self-corroborative when once impanelled. On the first day of the week the angel said to Mary Magdalene: "He is not here, for He is risen as He said. Come see the place where

the Lord lay."[1] The same morning He appeared to Simon Peter. In the afternoon, to the two disciples going to Emmaus; in the evening of the same day He appeared to the ten, Thomas being absent. After seven days He appeared to them again and said to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing." And Thomas answered and said unto him, "My Lord and my God."

During forty days after the resurrection He continued to manifest Himself to them from time to time; to the seven on the Sea of Tiberias; He was also seen of above five hundred brethren at once, most of whom lived twenty years afterwards; then again He was seen of James, and finally of all the apostles. He also manifested Himself to Paul. The number of the witnesses and the circumstances of their testimony afford infallible proof of the resurrection.

"It was not one person, but many, who saw Him, not only separately, but together; not by night only, but by day; not at a distance, but near; not once, but several times; they not only saw Him, but touched Him, conversed with Him, ate with Him, examined His person to satisfy their doubts."[2]

Christ's resurrection has endorsed every Christian hope and Bible promise. On the first Easter morning the cross was near enough to cast its shadow, but later in the day the disciples saw the risen Savior. They had joy mingled with sympathy, for to see the newly risen Lord was to see the fresh wounds. The

[1] Matt. 26: 6. [2] Paley's *Evidences*, Part ii, Chap. 3.

tomb was empty, but the pierced hands and wounded side were open. In the communion our heart should respond to the fellowship of His sufferings as well as to the inspiration of His resurrection. If we would make this resurrection truth an available hope for ourselves, we must inquire, Have we indeed risen with Christ, and do we partake of His life so that we may know of His resurrection?

"If ye be risen with Christ seek those things that are above."

THE GOSPEL IN THE SUPPER

I love to think of the Communion in its relation to the gospel, think how much of the Christian system is graphically set forth here. Like the gospel narrative, it is rich in the personality of Christ, and without Him it is nothing. If the gospel of the Communion only were preached there would be fewer disputes in theology, and more growth in grace and charity. With no other teaching we would still know:

(a) That Christ died a violent death, for of the loaf, which was *broken*, He said, "This is my body," and of the cup, "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many."

(b) That He died for others, for He said, "This is my blood which is given *for you*."

(c) That He was the procurative cause of pardon, for His blood was "shed for many unto remission of sins."

(d) That the fact and purpose of His death were to be proclaimed, for Paul said, "As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

(e) That in dying He became the object of hope, for the Supper is a symbol of triumph and not a report of despair.

(f) That after His example we are to sacrifice for others and love our fellow man.

Thus the Lord's Supper contains the heart of all the vital doctrines of salvation, and the proper administration of communion will educate the church to comprehend its mission. In the Communion the gospel of Christ's love and sacrifice is preached, proclaiming pardon and peace through the blood of His cross. In the Lord's Supper the central fact of Christianity is set forth without speculation or dogma, but in that simplicity of faith which invites the world, not to a creed, but to Christ; not to mere confession, but to a life and its larger meaning.

The symbols of Christ's broken body and shed blood "commemorate the love which reconciled us to God and always furnish us with a new argument to live to Him who died for us."[1] They take us with Mary and the disciples on Lord's Day morning to seek the Master, and help us to find His open wounds and empty sepulchre the evidence of His resurrection and assurance of His love.

To me the Communion speaks of the quality of our Lord's love, while the great commission marks its extent. In the commission His message and proclamation embrace the whole world, while in the Communion His sacrifice and love are especially concentrated upon His friends. Here He is the Savior of the Church (John 15:9).

---

[1] Alexander Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, p. 69, 1830.

When our Lord took the first element and said, "This is my body, which is given for you," He expressed the first principle and final essence of the gospel, viz., giving and doing for others. In the moral regeneration of the world, where so much giving of self and doing for others is required, Christ is the first fruit, as well as the finisher of our faith. Though we are but feeble exponents and imperfect followers of Him, the Communion ever reminds us of His example and will ever prove a keynote of His love.

THE FAMILY IDEA OF THE SUPPER

Nothing perhaps more than the Lord's Supper reminds us that this is our Father's house, a place hallowed with love and benediction. And if it is our Father's house it is our home—a place where we never questioned our right to be, with its tender memories recalling sweet associations, familiar faces, and glad reunions. We are not here merely as guests, but as children, members of God's family, and have our accustomed place at His table.

As was the passover, so also was the Lord's Supper originally a meal of the home. To the children a supper implies that one has toiled—toiled and loved for their sake. Supper still remains a family word, and through the early ages of Christian faith the Lord's Supper was a glad and sacred feast of the home, with no "imposing ritual of a stately ecclesiastical edifice."

Some of us have had several homes, but the best home to most of us—that which had the sweetest associations and the most precious memories—was that where we had our growth, where the voice of

childhood was heard with sympathy as tender and perfect as love could make it, and where the supper with its thanksgiving made the occasion religious and preparatory to undisturbed rest and serene peace. We cannot recall the days of our growth without remembering our father's table (where no one's place should be vacant) with its bountiful supply and happy fellowship. In like manner this church has not been much of a home to us unless we can recall serene moments and some growth and improvement—unless this table has brought us renewed joy and divine strength, and filled our hearts with peace and love.

The Lord's table presupposes, not only the tie of brotherhood and unbroken concord among believers, but intimacy and communion with God. This relationship converts the sanctuary into a home, and that home becomes a condition rather than a location; for David, who never was a priest, and could not make the temple his domicile, said, "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."[1] He had breathed the atmosphere of the sanctuary so deeply that her incense and hymns of love and praise made him ever conscious of Him who has "been our dwelling-place in all generations."[2]

We will not forget that He in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed gathered His disciples around Him as a family in the night in which He was betrayed, and honored the Supper.

Through this memorial may we look beyond and see ourselves, with all the families of earth, gathered to-

---

[1] Psa. 23: 6. [2] Psa. 90: 1.

gether through the death of Him whom we commemorate, into a higher and more perfect fellowship, to dwell at God's right hand where there is fulness of joy and pleasures forevermore.

THE COMMUNION HOMILY

"Paul discoursed with them," Acts 20: 7

In apostolic days, when the brethren came together to break bread, the communion service embraced all the elements of public worship, such as prayer, thanksgiving, song (and later doxology), reading of the Scriptures, the homily, and the collection for the poor. The Lord's Supper, which was older than the church itself, and was its first regular service, gave special place to prayer and religious instruction. This was in harmony with the Supper as celebrated by our Lord, which also had its thanksgiving and table-talk, or homily. When Paul broke bread with the church at Troas the Supper was both preceded and followed by teaching, which according to early tradition appears to have been an essential part of every communion. In that after-communion "talk" of Paul, the Greek verb ὁμιλήσας[1] (Acts 20: 11), from which our word homily is derived, is used, a word which meant a familiar table-talk of a conversational type, and not a formal or argumentative address.

The church at Corinth also was accustomed to a communion homily, for Paul declares unto them, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye pro-

[1] Though our *homily* is derived from a cognate noun (ὁμιλία), it has changed its meaning. The primitive homily meant a familiar talk, or conversation; it now means an exhortation, and not a formal pulpit address.

claim (by the homily) the Lord's death till he come." It is probable that the Supper, which at first was observed daily, afforded a special opportunity to impart the "apostles' doctrine," in which the disciples "continued steadfastly." This order was continued unchanged throughout the apostolic age, for Justin Martyr tells us that the homily was delivered by the presiding officer in the early part of the second century. And as indicative of the importance attached to it, we find the custom mentioned by Augustine in the fourth century. And it is known that Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and Ephraem the Syrian composed homilies for others to memorize and deliver.

Doubtless our ideas of the Lord's Supper are formed somewhat in accordance with our early training. To me no communion appears complete without some introductory exhortation. Partaking alone without the remembrance of Christ in loving words does not constitute a communion,[1] else would our private repasts at home be such. The reason our communions are not more effective is because we have neglected the preparatory homily, and in this respect departed from apostolic practice. We come together after a busy week, and attempt to preside sometimes with words unprepared and hearts unattuned, and find the hurried communion infringing on other services. Thus in some churches without adequate preparation and

[1] "There is no true administration of the Sacrament without the Word. For whatever advantage accrues to us from the Sacred Supper requires the Word; whether we are to be confirmed in faith, exercised in confession, or excited to duty, there is need of preaching. Nothing more preposterous, therefore, can be done with respect to the Supper than to convert it into a mute action." Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV, xviii: 39.

sufficient time for a serene and worthy communion, the ordinance abbreviated and straitened begs for existence. Would not our communions be improved were the brief homily to have its legitimate place and have equal care with the sermon in its preparation, so as not to jar on other parts of the worship? How can the soul repose for meditation if the service is abrupt and feverish?

The service need not be long, sad or austere, but the time should be quiet, unhampered and serene, so as to afford a sincere and deep remembrance of Christ. It would be an advantage if the communion were not followed by secular business and social engagements which terminate holy communings and obliterate divine vision, which the memory time affords. Of the early disciples it is said, "They sang a hymn and went out"—Jesus to the garden and the cross, and the disciples to follow His steps to the resort of prayer, and to tell of His love.

ANTICIPATION IN COMMUNION

"With desire I have desired," Luke 22:15

In the same night in which He was betrayed our Lord said to His disciples, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you, before I suffer." This expression of deep feeling implied, I desire to eat this passover with you, as the last that I shall ever celebrate before I suffer. Its profound spiritual aspirations confirms the Scripture, that He was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." This extraordinary longing reveals three aspects of the character of Jesus: (1) Anticipation of religious service, (2) Friendly attachments, and (3) Willing sacrifice.

(1) Anticipation. "With desire *I have desired to eat this passover.*" The first greeting in the Upper Room expressed a desire to carry out a well-matured purpose.[1] In these words He recognized the right of

[1] In an effort to remove discrepancy between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel, concerning the time of the Last Supper, Dr. F. C. Burkitt (*Journ. of Theolog. Studies*, p. 569, July, 1908) rejects the usual interpretation, and regards the words to be an "expression of disappointment and regret." He thinks that the Last Supper was an ordinary meal, and that our Lord's reference to "this passover," meant simply "the paschal meal of this present year," and not the meal then spread before them. He would paraphrase Luke 22: 15, 16 to this effect: "Near as this passover is and much as I have longed to celebrate it with you, it is not to be, for I shall not eat it; within the next twenty-four hours the enemy will have done his worst and the next passover that I shall eat with you will be the Messianic Feast." His article is subscribed to by his friend Dr. A. E. Brooke, who independently had arrived at the same conclusion.

While Doctor Burkitt's interpretation supports the Fourth Gospel, and aims to remove the discrepancy; it is unsatisfactory, because it assumes without adequate proof that Jesus was defeated in his purpose, and further is insufficient to disprove the combined testimony of the Synoptists and Paul that the Last Supper was a passover, and that fittingly at its close the Lord's Supper was instituted.

R. H. Kennett, D.D. (*The Last Supper*, p. 8, Cambridge, 1921), who accepts Doctor Burkitt's view and concludes "that our Lord's betrayal took place on the night before the passover," is considerably baffled when he attempts to explain away the allusion to "the cup of the covenant," found virtually in all the original documents of the Last Supper. If the Last Supper was not the passover, the reference in the cup to the "blood of the covenant" is unintelligible, and it is inexplicable why the New Testament (1 Cor. 5: 7), and all Christian literature should make the passover the background of the Lord's Supper. There have been many attempts to harmonize the accounts of the Last Supper as furnished by the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, which need not be repeated here. But as observed, "If John is right in placing the regular passover on the night after the crucifixion, and the Synoptists are also right when they tell us that Jesus ate the passover with his disciples on the previous evening, the only conclusion left to us is that Jesus and his disciples kept the feast a day sooner than it was kept by the rest of the Jewish community."

national feeling, and individual preferences, implying that prepared hearts, kindred minds, and consecrated seasons contribute to enhance the transport of worship and communion.

The passover service was rich in historic recital and thanksgiving (Exod. 12:26, 27), for to act as house-father, to offer the benedictions, deliver the haggadah, and give a morsel dipped in the dish to each guest with appropriate blessing afforded Jesus an opportunity to unfold the truths of His kingdom and the promises of the new covenant. The passover songs of deliverance too were laden with a wealth of memorial which related how in every impending peril God Himself had been found unmistakably near.

After his example, anticipation also should characterize our communions, that we may come to the Table with memories quickened, prayers inspired, and loving sympathy such as was felt by the sorrowing few who stood at the foot of the cross.

(2) Friendship. "With desire I have desired to eat this passover *with you*." The ties of friendship are based on some common vision and mutual interest. To Jesus and the disciples alike the kingdom was more than life. For it Jesus and His apostles had

---

J. C. Lambert, B.D., *The Sacraments of the New Testament*, p. 256, 1903.

Dr. W. Sanday after mature investigation was favorable to the view that the Last Supper was the Passover, Hastings' *Dict. Bible*, Vol. ii, p. 634. We also are agreeable to this view, for it is unbelievable that Jesus went to his death for only those of the Last Supper, as stated by the Western text, for why was his death necessary for them, and what "covenant" could he make after abandoning his purpose? According to the other text the "blood of the covenant" was "shed for many," and justifies the injunction, "This do in remembrance of me," which is vouched for by St. Paul and the faith of the early Church.

shared common experience. For it they had struggled with the problem of self-support, and knew what it meant to be hungry, destitute, and homeless. While slow results and misconception caused some to forsake Jesus with disappointment and vanished hopes, the apostles had caught a greater vision and declined to turn away; for to them Jesus Christ was the only one of whom they could say, "Thou hast the words of eternal life."

(3) Sacrifice. "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you, *before I suffer*." Jesus under the persecution of the priests and Pharisees had been driven into exile, or concealment, yet risked going up into Jerusalem, though impressed that the end was near. The finality of life is overwhelmingly solemn, impelling to contemplate the most vital things, so Jesus sought the quiet of the Upper Room to unbosom His heart to the apostles, and institute a new passover to foreshadow redemption from sin through the death of the cross. And for us too each communion with its sacred remembrance should be a moment of contemplation, that we may better perfect the soul's purposes while on our pilgrimage through this land of ordinances and probation.

Jesus desired to eat the passover with those who were to suffer for His name; and may we not believe that the memory of that table fellowship forever afterwards fortified them in their trials. We too shall have our temptations, but may they be overcome by the remembrance that the partakers of the bread of life are comrades of the Great Companion. The ministrations of friendship and the cup of the covenant will ever continue to be the most helpful agen-

cies to carry out righteous purposes and great sacrifices, and to meet trying ordeals in perfect peace.[1]

TIMES OF REFRESHING

Acts 3 : 19

We come to the Lord's Table, not with the sadness of sorrow, but with the solemnity which seeks communion with God.

But what is implied in this communion which we now seek? In the first place, fitness of mind on our part to approach Him who is invisible. He is present, not in the elements, but in the hearts of those who through the elements recall His love. If we have no penitence in our hearts and hunger for righteousness, and "blotting out of sin," we shall not know Him at the breaking of bread. Communion means an interchange of spirit, the heart rejoicing in God, and God responding to the outreachings and longings of our faith. It means an endeavor for closer relationship with God, partaking of a greater measure of His love. It means our faith recalling the sufferings and love of

[1] It is said that Lord Tennyson toward the end of his Summer had premonitions of the higher call, and made preparation for crossing the bar. He died while the October moon shone through the oriel window of his chamber, and silvered his noble face and the hand that clasped the volume of Shakespeare, which was the last book he read: He had "agreed to received the Holy Communion from his parish prists," but was careful to explain that he attached no sacrificial meaning to the sacrament. When the prist came to celebrate in the bed-room, the poet quoted the lines which he had put into the mouth of Cranmer:

"It is but a communion, not a Mass—
No sacrifice, but a life-giving feast."

J. T. Levens, *Aspects of the Holy Communion*, p. 168, London, 1911.

Christ, and exchanging the crown of thorns for a crown of glory.

Partaking at the Father's table implies peace with God, through faith in forgiveness through Christ—that peace, security, and trust which the child enjoys when the heart is confided to the father's guidance. It means that renewing and refreshing of our minds, which gives new confidence and supplies new inspiration for greater work, when the heart is filled with the consolation of the Spirit. Early in the history of the Church the one loaf suggested a unity of the one body, and all great souls forget their differences, and partake of the larger union of the Church Universal when they come under the shadow of the cross at the Lord's Table.[1] United in the "fellowship of his sufferings," may we find this an hour of blessed communion.

---

[1] *Washington at Communion.* When the American army, under the command of Washington, lay encamped in the environs of Morristown, New Jersey, it occurred that the service of the communion (there observed semi-annually only) was to be administered in the Presbyterian Church of that village. On a morning of a previous week, the general after his accustomed inspection of the camp, visited the house of the Rev. Doctor Jones, the pastor of the church, and after the usual preliminaries, thus accosted him: "Doctor, I understand that the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated with you next Sunday; I would learn if it accords with the canons of your church to admit communicants of another denomination?" The doctor rejoined: "Most certainly; ours is not the Presbyterian table, General, but the Lord's table; and we hence give the Lord's invitation to all his followers of whatever name." The general replied: "I am glad of it; that is as it ought to be; but as I was not quite sure of the fact, I thought I would ascertain it from yourself, as I propose to join with you on that occasion. Though a member of the Church of England, I have no exclusive partialities." The doctor reassured him of a cordial welcome, and the general was found seated with the communicants the next Lord's Day. *The Christian-Evangelist*, p. 204, February 15, 1923.

THE SACRAMENTAL IDEA IN THE SUPPER

When Jesus said of the loaf, "This is my body," he expected the disciples to discern, through faith, something more than bread. Through this symbolic representation the whole Christian world finds the feast of remembrance a thing of the heart, and (with baptism) one of the two fundamental sacraments of the New Testament. And as past generations have suffered from ritualistic over-estimation of the sacraments, there is equal danger now that the present generation will suffer from their under-estimation and displacement.

The Disciples of Christ (a brotherhood well known in America) have endeavored to restore to the Supper its original nomenclature and character, when it held a place as the great central event of religious worship in the early church. They generally speak of it as the "Breaking of Bread," "Lord's Supper," "Lord's Table," or "Communion"; but seldom use the terms most familiar to the religious world, viz., "Eucharist" and "Sacrament."

There is nothing especially objectionable in *Eucharist*[1] further than that it is a foreign word, and too limited to express the full meaning of the Supper, which is more than a thank-offering. For it is also a memorial feast, and communion, and like every sincere act of worship, a "means of grace."

The word *Sacrament*[2] is still more objectionable, be-

[1] Jesus "took the cup and gave thanks." The word for giving thanks is from εὐχαριστέω and the noun εὐχαριστία gives us eucharist, which means thanksgiving.

[2] It is apropos to give here the famous letter of Pliny, governor of Bithynia, in Asia Minor, to the Emperor Trajan, A. D., 112 (*Book* x, *Letter* 96), giving an account of the new religious sect of the Chris-

cause its doctrinal history involves controversial ambiguity, mysticism, and superstition. Those who use the word in its customary ritualistic meaning require the services of an ordained priest for the administration of the sacrament, and maintain that by his blessing the elements are mysteriously changed into the real body of our Lord, and are consequently too holy to be touched by unconsecrated hands.

Though the disciples prefer Bible names for Bible things, the misuse of the word should not deprive the

---

tians, who were multiplying rapidly in his province, for this is the first appearance of *sacramentum* in connection with Christianity. He inquired particularly as to their beliefs and customs, and elicited among other things that the sum of their error consisted in this: "They met on a stated day before it was light and sang hymns (or addressed a form of prayer) to Christ as God (*Carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem*), binding themselves by a solemn sacrament (or oath), not for the purposes of any wicked design, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up: after which it was their custom to separate, and then re-assemble to eat in common a harmless meal. From this custom, however, they desisted after the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I forbade the meeting of any assemblies (Hetæriai). After receiving this account I judged it all the more necessary to endeavor to extort the real truth by putting two female slaves (*ancillae*) to the torture, who were said to officiate in their religious rites (*quae ministrae dicebantur*), but all I could discover was evidence of an absurd and extravagant superstition." R. Lee Cole, M.A., *Love-Feasts*, p. 74, London, 1916.

Pliny does not appear to have understood what was meant by "sacramentum," nor could he discriminate between the Eucharist and Agape. But the picture drawn by this unsympathetic and cruel outsider who had extracted what knowledge he had from two poor slave girls, by torture, enables us to see the little company of obscure persons and slaves, meeting by stealth before dawn to worship Jesus Christ and join in a common meal, binding themselves by a solemn sacrament to faithfully fulfil the ordinary duties of life and to be honest and true and pure and just.

employment of it in its right sense, for the history of the Lord's Supper can't be written without it, and it has been observed that "Ideas mark the progress, sacraments the fixedness of Christianity."

In its classical usage the word *sacramentum* had two meanings. In the first place, it is best known as the soldier's military *oath*, though used also for similar vows and acts of obligation.

In the second place, it meant *mystery*. From its use in acts of solemn obligation, the term *sacramentum* came to designate the ceremonies of initiation and secret symbolism of the Græco-Roman mysteries, and was used as equivalent of μυστήριον in translation.

In scholastic times the Church taught that the sacrament is a mystery, made such by the Conciliar decrees that the prayer of consecration converts the elements by an objective subtle change such as the deceived senses are not able to detect.[1] It was a word of severity, dread, and ordeals and no wonder that it imparted a mystical awe and indescribable solemnity to the Communion. It is said that the family of a New York millionaire, when he was on his deathbed, had arranged for him to receive the "sacrament." When he was about to receive the bread, he said to the officiating minister, "Stop; will my partaking of

[1] As I speak, only for myself, I have not hesitated to use the word sacrament in this volume, as a synonym for Lord's Supper, without associating with it any extreme ritualistic idea. Though the notion of a sacramental saving efficacy conferred upon the recipient is repudiated, we would not forget that the sacrament, in all ages, in the face of persecution, temptation, and danger fortified the saints. In modern times it has had a hold upon Christians, by virtue of the sacredness it has inherited, the love it inspires, and the peace which approach to the cross imparts.

these elements lay any obligations upon me if I get well?" The minister, embarrassingly surprised, answered, "None, I hope, sir, but what you will be glad to observe." "Well, then go on," he said.[1] The millionaire had assumed that the communion was some profound vow, or spiritual bargaining, for which his heart was unprepared; and failed to recognize in it a privilege to remember Him, of whom it is written that "by the grace of God he should taste death for every man" (Heb. 2 : 9). The New Testament conveys no intimation that the Lord's Supper requires agonizing penance and overwhelming sorrow. It is possible that in times of persecution, when the eucharist was prohibited by the Roman emperors, the term sacrament was appropriate to express voluntary resolution to "suffer hardship as a good soldier of Jesus Christ" (2 Tim. 2 : 3).

Protestants do not find any more mystery in communion than there is in baptism, faith, and prayer. All the mystery that there is in remembering our Savior is back of His death, beyond the elements, and in the domain of faith. It is true we are but children, and to the limited comprehension of children there is somewhat of mystery in all things; but the more biblical and less theological we are in our vocabulary and practice, the more we shall enjoy the light of truth and experience the inward presence of the Master in the communion. The rite must be only the handmaid of faith, for Christ is more than sacraments; and the more we experience His indwelling presence the less we will require the assistance of material sacraments.

[1] Report of Dr. W. A. Belding.

THE SUFFERING SAVIOR

This is a memorial of our once suffering but now exalted Savior. It is befitting that this table should remind us of both His suffering and exaltation, for He was made "perfect through suffering"; and "if we suffer we shall also reign with him."

There are some individuals as well as denominations who are quite willing to exalt the life of Christ and magnify His character and teachings, but can see no purpose in His sufferings. They acknowledge the influence of His life, but ignore the efficacy of His death. But, as if they had made a mistake in denying His divinity and in refuting His atonement they still cling to the communion and regard the Lord's Supper a holy sacrament. If this table has any power to speak peace to our conscience it must come by way of the cross. If the sufferings of the cross had no more motive than to be a mere human example, if there were not even one drop of blood in our redemption, and if the Supper—the most sacred ordinance of Christianity—had only a human origin, it would not be easy to infuse into the communion that life and divinity which would bless and sanctify. All the power of this ordinance for strength and holiness is in the authority and personality of Him who said, "This do in remembrance of me." As long as this ordinance will retain its primitive meaning for us, so long will the crucifixion be full of purpose. As long as sin will call for a Savior, so long will this table invite us to the most significant event in Christ's life. The Bible ever directs us to Christ's death as the central point in the plan of human redemption.

The power of the cross is in the power of Christ's

willing suffering for sin. "He took part of all our miseries except our sins and the sinfulness of our nature, and these which He could not take *to* Himself He took *on* Himself."[1] In His life He suffered *with* us, in His death He suffered *for* us. What He could not do *in* us He did *for* us. What *we* could not bear *He* bore for us. Although we were thereby reconciled to God, it is only through communion with Christ and becoming partakers of the divine nature that we can become united to Him.

THE REAL PRESENCE

All religions known at the beginning of the Christian era show that they all possessed one feature in common—that of sacrifice.[2] The victim was offered, not only on the altar in Jerusalem, but also in the Parthenon at Athens, in the temple of Jupiter at Rome, in the stone circles and oak groves of the Celts, and in every fane and holy place throughout the world. But it is a characteristic of the Sermon on the Mount and the teachings of Jesus that God is approached largely without ritual and sacrifice. And the attempt to put a sacrificial construction on the Lord's Supper, to teach a literal *Real Presence*, is a sacerdotal retrogression derogatory to the atonement of Him,[3] who at the end of the ages was manifested

[1] E. B. Pusey, D.D., *The Presence of Christ In the Holy Eucharist*, p. 10, London, 1853.

[2] J. T. Levens, M.A., *Aspects of the Holy Communion*, p. 171, London, 1911.

[3] The doctrine of the Real Presence has arisen through a misinterpretation of our Lord's blessing for the bread and wine. He did not bless the bread, but blessed God for it; for we must infer that the blessing before the loaf was similar to that before the cup, which was

to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (Heb. 9:26).

When Jesus said of the bread, "This is my body," He taught no supernatural physical transformation. But at the same time, if we would find in the Supper a memorial of redemption and love that will impart strength and peace to the heart, we must find in it the presence and power of Christ. The term "*Real Presence*" was unknown to the primitive church, and apparently was coined to accompany the doctrine of transubstantiation, a fully developed product of the dark ages.

Faith, and not sense, must here find a real presence, for it is the spiritual and not the physical side of communion that brings a holy calm—a benediction of peace and joy to the soul. In order to avoid ambiguity we inquire in what sense is Christ present in the Supper.

I. *The Real Presence is not a physical presence.*

In speaking of this presence I would avoid on the one hand the ritualism and spiritualism which lead into mysticism and transubstantiation, and on the other the rationalism, hostile to sacraments, which ignores the privilege of faith to enthrone Christ in the heart as the Lord of the Supper.

It has been observed that Christ is present, not on the table, but in the heart. The strength of the communion is in its truth and not in its mystery. The elements are not holy by any mysterious change, but they are holy, or consecrated, because they are di-

---

a thanksgiving (Matt. 26:26, 27). That the blessing was synonymous with thanksgiving is made certain by a comparison with Luke, who says, "he took bread and gave thanks" (Luke 22:19).

vinely appointed to symbolize and commemorate a precious truth. The consecration of the elements is a thanksgiving, and not a prayer for their physical transformation. "Holy men of God" did not lose their physical nature when they became spiritual in character by triumphant faith, righteous living, and devotion to holy purposes. Likewise, the elements present no real presence to the eye of sense, but through faith become a memorial to recall the sufferings of the cross, and reveal a presence of Christ in that love which is shed abroad in our hearts.

II. *Results of the Sacrificial Doctrine of Communion.*

It was befitting that our Lord at the Supper should give thanks, for prayer and thanksgiving were the most ancient forms of consecration. Thanksgiving engages the heart, and is as essential to our communion as the elements themselves. But thanksgiving is not intended to produce some inwrought change in the elements; for the loaf which the disciples saw in the Master's hand did not become a duplicate of Himself; neither could there be a transubstantiation of the bread of which He Himself partook. But the doctrine of the Real Presence has been widely promulgated, and has colored the whole communion service of many churches besides the Roman.[1] It has trans-

[1] *Development of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.* It is interesting to observe how the sublimely simple Lord's Supper of apostolic practice, which was absolutely doctrine free, was elaborated ritually into the sacrificial doctrine of the Mass. In patristic literature certain phraseology, employed first symbolically, became current, gradually materialized to anticipate later doctrinal development of the Supper. Through allegorical and spiritual methods a sacrificial conception with some pagan embellishments was fastened on the celebration, and one writer repeated the error of the other.

Even the *Didache* ("*But on the Lord's day do ye assemble and break*

formed the Lord's table into an altar, on which the Blessed Lord is presented again and again as a real sacrifice. Then partaking of this sacrifice through the elements has come to mean absolution, or entire remission of sins; thus communion, instead of being

---

bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure," Chap. xiv). uses sacrifice (θυσία) for the prayer of thanksgiving. And Clement of Rome speaks of "offerings and liturgies," and of "offering the gift," as applied to the rite.

Justin Martyr is more mystical, for to him the eucharistic elements become consecrated food, and was the first to use μυστήριον for the Christian rite, which he compares with the pagan mysteries.

Ignatius, Irenæus, and Cyprian departed successively from apostolic simplicity and contributed materially to sacramental conceptions. Ignatius exalted unduly the authority of the bishop, without whom it was not lawful either to baptize or hold an agape (including eucharist). He called the church the altar-shrine, the place where sacrifices are offered; and thus fore-shadowed the doctrine of the Roman Church. Irenæus called the elements oblations, and for him the bread and mixed cup, on receiving the word of God became eucharist, identified with the body and blood of Christ (V. 11, 2). The communicants partaking are no longer corruptible (IV, xviii, 4). But even then there was no fixed liturgy.

Cyprian was an extreme ritualist, and spoke of the Supper with sacrificial terminology such as, "celebrating the Lord's sacrifice." Miraculous episodes were taught to attend the rite. Cyprian speaks of a defaulter who found the consecrated bread turned into a cinder in his hand (de Lapsis 25). With these supernatural transformations a sacrificial meaning dominated the Supper, and frequent celebration of the Mass became customary, while communion for the individual became more rare. Then with the supposed sanctity of the elements Masses for the souls of the dead, practised first in North Africa, became prevalent (Cyprian *Ep.* I, 2; Tertull. *de Cor.* 3).

Tertullian also followed the same trend, and frequently employed the term *sacramentum* for the Supper. Thus sacrificial ideals gradually asserted themselves upon the Supper, and fore-shadowed the leading tenets of the Mass. Now it became customary for Tertullian and his contemporaries to speak of "to handle the Lord's body," and become circumspect "to prevent a drop or crumb from falling to the ground" (de Cor. 3).

simply a service of loving remembrance, has become a *viaticum*, or heavenly passport for departing spirits. This same doctrine has made it customary to elevate the elements before the altar, as if our Lord were lifted bodily to receive the blow in our behalf.

But Cyril of Jerusalem (circa A. D. 348) was the first to use μεταβόλη to express the *change* effected in the elements by consecration.

Athenagoras (*Suppl. pro. Chr.* 13) speaks of "the bloodless sacrifice and rational service of Christians." Thus the errors of one age were transmitted to another. Paschasius Radbertus, abbot of Corbei (844–51) wrote a treatise asserting that the historical and sacramental Christ were one and the same. This view conferred great dignity and importance upon clerical orders. The treatise was dedicated to Emperor Charles the Bold, who upon receiving it referred two questions bearing on it to the monk Ratramnus; viz.: Whether the consecrated elements contain a hidden power recognized by faith and not by sight; and secondly, as to the identity of the risen body of Christ with the sacramental. Ratramnus assented to the first, and mystified the second with strong sacramental views.

Berengarius who at first reasoned against transubstantiation, raised the question: When the elements are transformed into the "body of Christ," is that the same body as was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered on the cross, and ascended into heaven? He held that the change was only a form of a pledge. But he was forced by the Synod held 1079 to acknowledge that the consecrated elements are substantially changed into the true and natural flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary. But transubstantiation did not become officially a Roman Catholic doctrine until the Council of the Lateran A. D. 1215, declared the bread and wine transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ.

Then to attempt to obviate the difficulties and contradictions arising upon the expectation that the body of Christ should attend multitudinous consecrations, Thomas Aquinas (1227–74) defined church doctrine and enlarged on the difference between substance and accident. The Council of Trent (1545–63) decreed, "If any one shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist there is contained truly, really, and substantially the Body blood along with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ; but shall say that the Presence is symbolical, or is a figure: let him be anathema."

The sacrificial conception implies that the prayer of consecration transforms the nature of the bread and wine, so that they become not symbolically but physically the very flesh and blood of Christ. Then naturally the elements are adored, and caused the Communion to acquire a sacredness of diction surpassing that applied to the person of our Lord; for whereas He is addressed without any sacred appellation, the Supper is called the "holy Supper," the "holy Communion," and the "holy Sacrament." This idea of extreme holiness has separated the table from the congregation, and placed it within an enclosure, like the ark of the covenant, fenced off so as not to be touched except by holy or consecrated hands.

III. *The Real Presence is a spiritual presence.*

We have in the Supper the spiritual presence of Christ, but this is not absolutely peculiar to this ordinance. We hesitate to emphasize the divine presence in Communion because we consciously lack that hunger and thirst for righteousness which should enable the pure in heart to see God; yet the Bible undoubtedly teaches divine companionship, for "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20). Then if the indwelling was also a post-communion promise (John 14:21, 23), may it not fittingly be fulfilled in the Supper, which often is rich in spiritual experience. But the indwelling presence implies contrite preparation, for no priest's consecration of elements can avail if we regard sin in the heart. If we would become partakers of the divine nature we must acquire the disposition that will prove hospitable to the divine presence. Partaking alone will not assure this pres-

ence, but our remembrance of Christ by an outreaching faith must be so transforming as to remove all bitterness and selfishness and furnish a purified heart for that fellowship which is from above. The highest function of religion is to open the eternal aspirations of the heart for the divine, and let the joy of remembrance and recognition, like the glory of old, fill the temple.

THE GRACE OF THE COMMUNION

"For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,"
2 Cor. 8:9

In a world where there is much to disturb and discourage it is natural to believe that the Lord's Supper was instituted in order to confirm our faith and refresh our spiritual life. The communion does not accomplish its full purpose in us unless it makes us to have a higher regard for Christ, more love for the church, and more hope in our own future. But is it possible for the communion to impart the grace which we need for daily burdens and overwhelming sorrow?

There are moments of depression in every life, when continued misfortunes and keen disappointments bring sad moods which momentarily suggest that we are infinitesimal and helpless creatures in a vast universe. There are times when we feel that our best efforts are deficient—when everything seems transient and soon to be forgotten—when the part we play in life appears utterly insignificant. Such moods come to all men past the meridian of life more or less, and are liable to take root unless offset by faith and the grace of the communion spirit.

Is there an antidote for these feelings of depression and unnecessary despair? Yes, the sympathy and approval of others, especially of Him who for our sakes became poor, that we "through his poverty might become rich." Nothing perhaps is more potent to restore our equanimity and inspire us with new hope than the remembrance that others are interested in us, and that we are a part of a great purpose. If in retrospection we place ourselves in our old home, and think how parental love viewed us; what sacrifices were made for our education to give us equal advantages with others, what rejoicings experienced over our progress, what faith entertained in our victory over life's early struggles, and what anticipations of our useful future, happy in a home and respected in society. If we have failed to measure up to our parents' expectation, we can admire the scope of their plan and the sincerity of their affection.

In like manner the communion should remove disquietude and despondency. The Lord's Supper is not an instrument of despair and defeat, but a token of the permanent and triumphant through Christ, and an assurance that the Lord is still present and His grace abounding. The communion is an institution of the Church founded by our Lord, against which the gates of hades shall not prevail, and communicants pledge their faith in it. And those weak and weary should find here an assurance: "My grace is sufficient for thee, for my power is made perfect in weakness" (2 Cor. 12:9).

The Lord's Supper is a testimony that Christ conceived great things for His church, and willingly bore for her the death of the cross. The great Shepherd

of the sheep knoweth His possession, and calleth "his own sheep by name" (John 10:3, 14). There may be mysteries in providence and in the Supper,[1] but the evidences of divine compassion and love are abundant and enough to dispel the twilight of our perplexity. Christ Himself is the measure of the communion grace, and He Himself can refresh the weary and heavy-laden in his pilgrimage. His easy yoke makes the burden light, for the yoke is made for two, and no burden is heavy when yoked to Omnipotence (Matt. 11:28).

WEEKLY COMMUNION

"For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. 11:26).

This language, as I understand it, is expressive of the manner and purpose, rather than of the frequency of observing the Lord's Supper; but there isn't anything in it inconsistent with weekly communion. The Lord's table deserves our weekly observance, for it preaches the same gospel as Paul proclaimed when he said, "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). It is the gospel in symbols. It proclaims faith

[1] "Whenever the human soul enters into close and personal dealings with God there will be mysteries, of love and grace and compassion on the one side, of faith and humility on the other. But they are spiritual mysteries, unutterable not because they cannot be experienced, but because they cannot be explained. So when Christ is given and received in and with the elements, the deep calleth unto deep, the line of human interpretation will find abysses of grace and blessing which its line can never sound." H. R. Mackintosh, D.D., *The Expositor*, p. 197, April, 1903.

in a crucified Redeemer, and hope in an ascended Savior, who will come again. It means nothing to us unless it shows the Lord's death—a death made necessary that God "might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus" (Rom. 3:26).

(1) Weekly communion is supported by inference and history, rather than by direct command.[1] Its beginning is closely associated with that of the Sunday service. For on the day of Pentecost, which that year was a Sunday, we find the disciples "all together in one place," and it would seem that the eucharist was a part of the religious service of the day, for among other things "they continued steadfastly in the Breaking of Bread" (Acts 2:42). Through this steadfastness it is believed that they allowed no Lord's Day to pass without communion for the first three centuries. In harmony with this custom Paul tarried seven days at Troas, doubtless that he might break bread, not for, but with the disciples on the first day of the week

[1] The Lord's Supper and the Lord's Day are of kindred origin, and so distinctly connected with Christ that both are designated by the same adjective. The word κυριακὸς was not in the LXX, and though Augustus and Tiberius declined the title of "Lord," because this oriental title was contrary to Roman ideas, nevertheless it was employed as a designation of the Roman Emperor in Paul's time. "It is proved, however, by the inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca, that it was used in the official language of the Greek East (Egypt and Asia) to mean "pertaining to the Lord, i. e. the Emperor, imperial." A. Deissmann, *The Expository Times*, p. 205, February, 1907.

Therefore, Paul did not coin a new adjective when he called the Breaking of Bread κυριάκον δεῖπνον, The Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:20). It is possible that the title "Lord's Day" was applied equally early to the first day of the week, though our earliest extant example is recorded in Rev. 1:10: ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρα. It was employed soon afterwards by the *Didache* c. xiv, and by Ignatius (*Epist. Magn.* 9. 1.).

(Acts 20: 7). This narrative represents a Christian assembly, meeting on the first day of the week, and not on the Jewish Sabbath, for worship and the Breaking of Bread. Therefore, it is a reasonable supposition that they were accustomed to do this every week; for we learn that the Christian church at Corinth and the brethren of Asia were accustomed to "come together" every first day of the week, and elsewhere the Eucharist is represented as the vital cause of their coming together. No less than four times within half a chapter (1 Cor. 11: 18, 20, 33, 34) does the apostle connect their "coming together in one place" with the Eucharist. He represents them "coming together in the church" to observe the Lord's Supper, and implies that this could not be done at home. Thus, it is plain that the Lord's Supper was a church ordinance, and as such observed at regular intervals. It occupied as conspicuous a place as preaching, and we have no evidence in the New Testament that any congregation of disciples came together upon the Lord's Day without this being a part of the worship.[1]

(2) Seeing then that the early disciples taught by the apostles themselves observed weekly communion, those having the same Lord, the same faith, and the same hope, with equal cause for gratitude ought to follow the same practice now.[2]

---

[1] On account of weekly communion, Sunday was called *dies panis*, the bread day.

[2] "But on the Lord's Day do ye assemble and break bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure." *Didache*, c. xiv. Pliny's famous letter to Trajan 100 A. D. seems to imply that the Christians of Asia Minor kept a weekly celebration of the Supper. Justin Martyr writing at Rome about 150 A. D. speaks of the Lord's Supper as being celebrated every

(3) Christ gave no command to commemorate His resurrection, and yet united Christendom has discarded the Jewish Sabbath, and in honor of Him who rolled away the stone and left an empty sepulchre come together to record the fact every first day of the week. But though our Lord made a tender request that the Supper be kept in remembrance of Him, it is sadly neglected. It would seem reasonable and proper that while His resurrection is celebrated fifty-two times a year, His death were celebrated equally often, instead of once a month, or once a year, as is the practice of some churches.

(4) If the Lord's Supper is a monumental institution it must be observed at stated times, for we know that every memorial event from the Jewish Passover to the American Independence is celebrated at regular intervals.[1]

(5) The Lord's Supper is full of meaning and pur-

Sunday. (*Apolog.* 1. 67.) Tertullian at Carthage, implies that it was observed even more frequently. (De Orat c. x.) Hippolytus, Cyprian, and the Fathers of the Third and Fourth Centuries show that the Lord's Supper was celebrated daily in their time.

[1] "It is years now since W. E. Gladstone said that 'the greatest object of all is the re-establishment of the Eucharist in its proper and Scriptural place as the central act of at least our weekly worship.' " W. H. Abraham, D.D., *Op. Cit.*, p. 344.

"It still remains for us however to restore the Eucharist to its central place as the chief, if not the most largely attended, act of Sunday worship. With nothing short of this may we be content." Charles Gore, D.D., *The Body of Christ*, p. 276.

"It is not ritual we plead for, nor elaborate choral services, but the thing itself, apart from any adjuncts. The weekly Eucharist celebrated in a surplice, and without a note of music, is as valid as the most elaborate celebration in a fashionable church with every kind of symbolic aid." W. H. Abraham, D.D., *Op. Cit.*, p. 320.

There is no intimation in New Testament that the Breaking of Bread required any clerical adjuncts.

pose. It is a faithful witness to the truth of Christianity, and an eloquent preacher of the gospel of hope. If any one doubts that such a person as Jesus ever lived, that He died, and rose again the third day, according to Scriptures (1 Cor. 15:3, 4), this table asks: How then will you account for the origin of the Lord's Supper and the Lord's Day?

The Communion is transforming, and helps to reproduce in us the unselfishness, purity, and love of Him whom we commemorate. It is a service that requires not the multitudes. It can be observed with half a dozen as well as with half a thousand. And its observance has supplied the motive for preserving weak churches, and keeping them from disbanding (Heb. 10:25). The time will come when the friends of Jesus in every clime will desire to remember His death every Lord's Day. Thus may He be remembered more—more often, and more lovingly.

"More love to Thee O Christ,
More love to Thee," &c.

A SUNDAY WITH PAUL

"And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread" (Acts 20:7). There were many present doubtless in that distinguished company who had been brought up in the Hebrew faith, but we infer that the disciples were not Sabbatarians, but worshiped on "the first day of the week" in honor of the resurrection of our Lord. As the Jewish Sabbath was lost in the newer "day of sacred rest," so also was the passover superseded by the Lord's Supper.

It seems that to refresh their love and remembrance of the Lord's death the disciples practised weekly communion, for whatever else was observed in their worship breaking the loaf was the central event of their coming together.[1] If those living so near the cross found weekly communion necessary, surely we who are more remote need more greatly its refreshing influence. Our inference that the primitive disciples broke bread upon the first day of the week is well sustained by church history, and occurred in this particular instance towards evening, for Paul continued his discourse until break of day.

We can picture to ourselves Paul's stay in that land of heroic memories—now preaching to the Trojans, and forming new associations, now exchanging fraternal greetings, and confirming the brethren. To himself it was a week of anxious looking forward to a Lord's Day, filled with the memory of Christ, in which his fellow-disciples would be drawn closer around the Lord Himself. Paul in his hurried journey remained at Troas seven days, apparently that he might break bread with the disciples on the first. There is no intimation that he was to break bread *for* them, but *with* them. It was not Paul, but "the disciples," who "came together to break bread." Breaking bread was as much of a congregational act as preaching was of a pastoral act.[2] Some think that the sacrament should be exclusively in charge of ordained men, and that in the absence of ordained func-

[1] Paul tarried *seven* days probably so as to commune, Acts 20: 6.

[2] This is the only recorded instance of Paul's personal participation in the celebration, yet his language implies that he habitually observed the Supper with others. See 1 Cor. 10: 10, and 11: 25, 26.

tionaries communion cannot be observed, hence the customary unscriptural phrase, "The preacher is breaking the bread of life for them;" as if access to the Master were only through priestly intercession, forgetting that those who have purified their souls in "obedience to the truth" are qualified as members of a "holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 2:5).

It is befitting that this supreme Christian act should be congregational and that the brethren in general should surround the Lord's Table on common ground, without the intervention of order or ritual to rule any worthy communicant ineligible to preside, if necessary. The breaking of bread is an individual work that no one can do for us. We are personally to discern the Lord's body, and personally to endeavor to lift ourselves into closer communion with God in Christ.

THE GREAT COMPANION

"Enoch walked with God," Gen. 5:24

We have come now to the place and to the service which would have everything else set aside, so that we may see Jesus. To associate in our minds the idea of being with our Lord spiritually has a transforming power. Doubtless the Master Himself desired to perpetuate this thought, and implied that His presence is heartening, for He said, "Lo, I myself am with you all the days."

Personal contact is not the most essential part of fellowship. It is possible for two persons to walk arm and arm with nothing in common, their minds truly being elsewhere. On the other hand, whether

present or absent the truest communion exists between those of kindred spirits, who intuitively understand each other's purposes and correctly interpret each other's motives. It must be gratifying to our Lord, who was so much misunderstood while on earth, to be now understood and adored by an innumerable company which desire His spiritual companionship.

Nearness to Christ is transforming, and affords better recognition of His character, more exalted experience of His peace, and more abiding confidence in His love. Our Lord gave us this table that we may think of Him, and know Him as He is. We cannot keep step with Him unless we know Him, and unless our walk is controlled by Him in direction and destiny. Divine companionship is the highest expression of religious aspiration and the highest altitude in Christian experience, for John said, "Our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ."

The thought of being with Jesus is so full of hope and expectation that Paul was partly willing to abandon his mission and surrender himself to the "desire to depart and be with Christ." In summing up the end of all things the one sentence which portrays the domain of unending joy is, "So shall we ever be *with* the Lord." His presence will be the theme of all our thanksgiving and the admiration of all our love, for, as of old, after that transfiguration we will be satisfied to see "Jesus only." The Lord's Supper implies a moment with Jesus, with Him in the great events of His life, that in the contemplation of His sacrifice our hearts may feel the embrace of His love.[1]

[1] General Horatio King asking President Lincoln the question: "Do you love Jesus?" received the following reply: "When I left

The Communion has a forward look and is a preparatory meeting-place; for the apostle says, "As often as ye eat the bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."[1] I heard Dr. W. A. Belding remark that, "While Christ at His second coming shall find the inhabitants of this world variously engaged, there will be no more fitting place for His people than at His table, both remembering and expecting their Lord."

THE SUPPER A MEMORIAL

"Lest we forget, lest we forget"

It has been said that the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper are like the inscription upon a monument; for the individual they stimulate remembrance and for the church they constitute a memorial. To those in the Upper Room, individually and collectively then, His request had the double meaning of "This do in remembrance of me," and "This do for my memorial."

All may not see at once the full difference between a remembrance and a memorial. The token of remembrance may be private and may never be repeated. Friends sometimes are prompted by remembrance and love to present gifts or mementoes. These mementoes are more than remembrance, for they are visible and form miniature monuments. Remembrance is largely an emotion wholly within ourselves.

Springfield, I asked the people to pray for me, I was not a Christian. But when I went to Gettysburg, and saw the graves of thousands of our soldiers, I then and there consecrated myself to Christ. Yes I do love Jesus." *The Christian-Evangelist*, p. 204, February 15, 1923, St. Louis, Missouri.

[1] 1 Cor. 11:26.

It may possess only individual interest, and, like "many a flower born to blush unseen," be hidden for the sole love of some poor heart that would be a desert without it. But a memorial is more formal and permanent than remembrance. The elements of the Supper are mementoes and through the faith and love which they express constitute a memorial designed to recall and perpetuate remembrance. A memorial is public in character and gathers meaning from association and fellowship. Remembrance may have in it all the love of the individual, but a memorial has in it the gratitude, appreciation, and honor of a society or country. Comrades when living renew their remembrance in reunion, but for their departed friends make memorials in their tributes and monuments.

"Christ crucified is the centre of gravity in Christian doctrine. And the Lord's Supper is a monument erected and consecrated to the memory of the Lord's death."[1] Christ has conferred honor on His church by establishing the Lord's table as a memorial, for though He knew the church to be imperfect, yet of what better organization could He make the request, "This do for my memorial?"

The Lord's Supper possesses the essential features of all memorials:

(1) It has an historical importance. It reminds us of a worthy name and an accomplished fact, and aims to preserve the love and gratitude which the memory of Christ evokes. As a memorial the Supper has an evidential value which gives to Christianity a distinct and continuous history.

[1] Charles Jerdan, M.A., *For the Lord's Table*, p. 97, London, 1899.

(2) Our Lord by instituting a memorial predicted His own bodily absence, a thing wholly inconsistent with transubstantiation. Memorials bespeak the absence of the central agent, but aim to record his deeds so that his memory may awake the former feeling to feed the soul on past experience. Christ has recognized our proneness to forget and made a prudent provision to assist our remembrance.

(3) This memorial, while it looks to the past, has a place for our faith. Remembrance speaks of an absent Lord, but the communion looks to a present Savior. Without faith the Lord's table is a memorial only, but through faith it is a blessed communion —a place where the risen Lord meets His people to comfort and strengthen them through His spirit. Bishop Ken said, "A bare remembrance of thee is not enough. . . . Work in me all those holy and heavenly affections which become the remembrance of a crucified Savior."[1] So may we say, a bare memorial is not enough, but may we feel the power of an endless love and the communion of a present Christ.

A PARTING REQUEST

"This do"

It was for Jesus Himself to institute the Lord's Supper, and enjoin, "This do in remembrance of me." Reforms mark the progress of religion, but sacraments express the fixedness of Christianity. Christians may voice new truths and initiate reforms, but Jesus only could introduce the sacraments of His religion. If it had been left to the disciples to ordain a memorial of

[1] Bishop Ken, *Approach to the Altar*, p. 7.

Him for the Church, they probably would have commemorated some miracle or parable, and not have instituted the Lord's Supper,[1] which for its simplicity and significance is looked upon as the greatest ordinance in the world.

When I began this study of the Supper as the *parting request of Jesus* I was led to think of the confidence and reliance imposed in parting requests. What hearts' desires and sacred expectations they disclose! Ian Maclaren, in the *Beside the Bonnie Brier Bush*, tells of the dying wish of a Scotch mother to her son, "If God calls ye to the ministry, ye'll no refuse, an' the first day ye preach in yir ain Kirk, speak a gude word for Jesus Christ, and, John, I'll hear ye that day, though ye'll no see me, and I'll be satisfied."

But would the Supper simply as a parting request satisfy a sinner, or even a saint? How inadequate are human affection and dying requests to express the meaning and power of the Communion! But what is it that gives sublimity and validity to this ordinance beyond all parting requests? Is it not the *vicarious, social, and confiding* aspects of the Last Supper?

The passover recalled the mediation of God in the deliverance of Israel, and being replaced by the Lord's Supper helps us to understand the symbolism and hold of that sacrament upon the Church. In the passover, the blood sprinkled was a token of forgiveness, and signified three things for Israel, viz., divine deliverance and fellowship, national unity, and anticipation of the coming of the Lamb of God with the Messianic blessings of the new covenant.

The passover proclaimed generous and unlimited

[1] Rev. David Smith, M.A., *The Pilgrim's Hospice*, p. 31, 1906.

provison for deliverance. On passover night the door was left open, in compliance with a tradition that Elijah might return, and as a sign of hospitality and welcome to the stranger. In this we see that the old covenant was elastic and its provisions not exclusive.

1. *In the Lord's Supper its vicarious and comprehensive character is its chief asset.* For it is said that "He took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them and said, Take ye, this is my body." "And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many" (Mark 14: 22–24).

In the similitude of the passover with the "body given," and the "blood shed for many," the vicariousness of the transaction proclaims the provisions of salvation to be as universal as the terms of the new covenant. Therefore, while the Last Supper in one aspect was a parting request, it was much more than a Mizpah, for the very act of remembering Jesus reminds us what He has done for us and what He may still do in us.

2. *The Lord's Supper holds the veneration of the Church too on account of its social character.* The recollection of the Upper Room represents Jesus Christ among His brethren, approving national customs, and fostering religious aspirations. What historic memories and friendly counsels filled His heart that night! He had said before, "I have a baptism to be baptized with and how I am straitened till it be accomplished" (Luke 12: 50). And now He knew what every omen

meant and "was troubled in spirit" (John 13:21). Thus the approach of the final crisis constrained Him to embrace those who had shared His privations and dangers with the words, "This do in remembrance of me," a message far-reaching in its anticipations and as tender as the words from the cross.

3. *The Communion has in it also the confiding request of the Master*, "This do in remembrance of me." Herein our Lord appeals to the love of His followers and ordained the Supper to perpetuate it. Privations and persecutions had strengthened bonds of friendship between Jesus and His disciples, and multiplied ties of endearment and love. At the Supper His affection became demonstrable, for He "loved them to the end," or uttermost; and said, "I have called you friends." And John's comment on this friendship was, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." There is the stress of the communings of the Upper Room and in the contemplation of His own self-surrender, He said, "This do in remembrance of me." Then what further light does the Lord's Supper originating in this parting request cast upon the character of our Lord?

(a) It is a testimony to the genuineness of His mission, for it is only a true life that appeals to remembrance. It attests that Jesus' life was pure and trustworthy, His associations honorable and good, and His faith in the kingdom unfailing.

(b) He ordained the memorials of His death to proclaim the survival of His love. What remembrance, gratitude, and joy marked the solemnities of the Upper Room! There in the glow of friendship and adoration of worship was forged the Sacrament,

which throughout the ages has been the trysting-place of loyal hearts. "Take ye, this is my body." Thus though rejected of men the Savior presented Himself symbolically as the anointed of God and the Redeemer of the world.

(c) "This do" tells of an approved performance and records an appeal for continued fellowship. A parting request has in it the friendship that is willing to forget wrongs and shortcomings for the sake of the love which "beareth all things." This parting request is an appeal ever to renew the spirit of the Upper Room, and through faith to intensify our remembrance of Jesus Christ, whom, as Peter said, "not having seen ye love" (1 Pet. 1:8). Faith which is the fruit of the heart, and not of the intellect, sees the vicarious, social, and confiding in the Communion, and compresses the whole life and passion of our Lord into this remembrance, which rejoices in redeeming love and refreshing communion with the Almighty.

A TALK TO NEW COMMUNICANTS

Sincere Christians in all ages have attached great value to the Lord's Supper. This is the first communion to many of you. Doubtless you have looked forward to it with great expectation; and have asked possibly what thoughts must occupy your mind during the communion act. The thoughts and experiences of the first communion, if they were recorded, would help every Christian through his whole life. The prayers and resolutions of this hour, if recalled in time of temptation, will "keep you from falling."

The most satisfactory communion is that which has been preceded by a season of self-communion and a

quiet heart preparation; for though the Lord's Supper is a memorial, it is not all retrospection, or remembrance. We also need introspection to adjust the golden censer of our inner temple, for if by retrospection we identify Christ, we thus find Him here and now, and it is impossible that He should visit the soul and not leave something Christ-like within.

Self-communion leads prodigal and saint to self-recognition and to parental love—a state where the angels are near and the Father's bread abundant. Here we forsake sin, and find the Savior and the joy of forgiveness. When the soul returns to God's old home, to the innocency of childhood and love of the good, it is a time for self-inspection and thanksgiving. A place at the Father's table fills the heart and perhaps the eye with mingled feelings, as Bishop Ken felt, who said: "O, that with Mary Magdala I could weep much and love much, having so much to be forgiven."[1]

It is only through self-communion that we can come to the most fruitful communion; for Paul said, "Let a man examine or prove himself." Not that he may make himself fit or worthy to commune, but that he may bring himself into the right spirit and into the right relationship to his fellow-man and to God. Our Lord enjoined that when we come to worship if we remember that our brother hath aught against us, we are first to be reconciled to our brother, and then come and offer our gift.

When we approach the communion table we must forget the world and make room for the peace of God. Fervent faith bringing the cross into view

[1] Bishop Ken, *Approach to the Altar*, New Edition, 1885.

must melt down every human pride and selfishness. When Calvary arises before our spiritual eye no obstructive obstacle should conceal the vision. The table is spread in view of the cross, and will ever recall the love that expected to be remembered, and in memory of that love our first communion too found peace and confidence and the loving companionship of those who walk in the light.

EATING AND DRINKING UNWORTHILY

In the Lord's Supper we have a privilege in which the responsibility rests wholly on the individual Christian and not upon the church.

Paul said, "Let a man examine himself,"[1] but he nowhere enjoins that he should subject himself to an examination by another. The sense of individual responsibility unduly dwelt upon, and an inadequate conception of what Paul said to the Corinthians[2] about eating and drinking unworthily cause some to make the communion a season of distress and gloom, instead of being a token of life and salvation.

Self-examination should not be emphasized to an extent that would make the communion a source of depression, nor on the other hand should the lack of heart preparation be passed over so lightly as to turn the Lord's Supper into a light and perfunctory ceremony. If we are in sympathy with the mind which was in Christ Jesus the solemnity of the cross will reflect the light and strength of the resurrection.

Paul censured the Corinthians for corrupting the Lord's table, and abusing its fellowship. As the ordinance during the first century frequently followed

[1] 1 Cor. 11:28. [2] 1 Cor. 11:20-22, 30-34.

a special meal, or Love-feast, it was possible for the Corinthians to desecrate the Lord's Supper by eating and drinking to excess. That there should be no opportunity for this abuse the Lord's Supper and the Love-feast were separated in the fourth century.

The communion originally was a supper (not necessarily an evening meal),[1] and the Corinthians no doubt partook on a larger scale than is now customary, but Paul indicated that the amount consumed was immaterial, and approved that it should be less, saying, "If any man is hungry let him eat at home."[2] The Lord's table is a feast for the spiritual man, and it is the amount of remembrance, love, and divine transaction attending the elements that makes the communion effective.

Paul was not passing judgment upon the persons partaking, but was censuring the unworthy manner of the act. "There is a vast difference between receiving the body and blood of the Lord unworthily, and being unworthy to receive."[3] If we examine Paul's indictment of the Corinthians we infer that their offence consisted in three things:

(1) They converted the Lord's Supper into an ordinary meal, or disorderly banquet, and failing to wait one for another, ate and drank to excess. "What Paul has to complain of is the want of solemnity."[4]

(2) A selfish exclusiveness prevailed, dividing the brethren into schisms, which ignored the poor, allow-

[1] At the beginning persecution and fear, and the memory of the Last Supper, were conducive to the nocturnal celebration of the Lord's Supper.

[2] 1 Cor. 11:34. [3] Rev. Carey E. Morgan.

[4] Ernest Von Dobschutz, D.D., *Christian Life in the Christian Church*, p. 21, London, 1904.

ing their poverty to debar them from the social refreshments and the communion table.

(3) They failed to "discern the Lord's body." The purpose of the Supper was forgotten, the Savior was dishonored, and the poor for whom Christ died were neglected, denied a place at His table and made to look on at a distance.

Such condition as existed at Corinth cannot prevail now, for in our practice it is impossible for one to be "hungry and another drunken"; but it may be possible yet to eat and drink unworthily, if we depreciate the sacred purpose of this memorial and fail to properly estimate the Savior's sacrifice and the fellowship of His people.

It is possible yet to distort the Lord's Supper, and on the one hand rob the elements of their symbolic meaning, an error which caused the Corinthians to profane the Supper with over-indulgence; or, on the other hand, to re-incarnate them with a ritualistic real presence, an error which tends to the adoration of the elements and the withholding of the cup from the laity. But Paul asserts that a man may eat as well as drink unworthily, but he nowhere implies that the cup should be withheld even from the offending Corinthians, nor does he imply that their deplorable offence was unpardonable. He gives no ground to infer that responsibility is annulled by non-participation, but commends self-examination as the only safeguard.[1]

Self-examination will show us our sinfulness and unworthiness, but will lead us to cast ourselves more unreservedly upon Christ. No one who sincerely de-

[1] J. S. Candlish, *The Christian Sacraments*, p. 112, Edinburgh.

sires to honor the Savior need fear of eating and drinking unworthily. Communion is not for the perfect, but for the weak and weary, but who at the same time have a pure endeavor and honest desire to remember and honor our Lord.

To be a worthy communicant is to make the Lord's table recall the memory of the dear Lord, and here find in His sufferings the assurance of His love, and thus in the spirit of thanksgiving go to Him for spiritual strength and renewed hope—go to Him, the Fount of every blessing, to fill our own hearts of His immeasurable love.

COMMUNION WITH THE SICK

In times of sickness and suffering life would be unbearable if we were not looking for something better. If Christ be writ large in our future, the ills of life vanish, and we will say with the Psalmist, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it" (Psa. 118:24). Sickness is a universal possibility, but in every situation faith can say, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me" (Phil. 4:13).

The Communion is a very proper service to give peace to the sick, "to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he himself said, It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts 20:35). This is one of the unrecorded sayings of Jesus. These so called *agrapha*, in their history and character are not all of unquestionable authenticity. But even if Paul had not vouched for the authenticity of this *logion* we would have no doubt of its genuineness. It breathes the spirit of Jesus, and confirms our own

experience that every conscious effort is recorded in our memory. When we repeated the Multiplication Table for the first time it was very difficult, but became easier with each repetition. And why? Because each recitation recorded itself on our mental register more indelibly. Therefore, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," not on account of what the giving accomplishes, but rather on account of the good registered in ourselves. Thus, in sickness when the nights are long, the memory of kindly acts follows us (Rev. 14: 13), and God "giveth songs in the night" (Job 35: 10). Therefore, we should always abound in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know that our labor is not in vain (1 Cor. 15: 58).

Sickness is not without its lessons; it is rich in remembrance—the kindness of friends and the goodness of God. Life has been altogether sweet; at ten, fifteen, and twenty—yes, life was crowned with the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living (Psa. 27: 13). But the Communion is so rich in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ whose presence is helpful in the hour of suffering and triumphant beyond this life to the blessedness that knows no pain.

Each Communion should be a mile-stone in our progress, a record of sweet meditation, and an appeal to new endeavor. This progress is a condition of our being and without it life is no pilgrimage.

In olden time, when long pilgrimages were undertaken, owing to the slow travel and the uncertainty of entertainment, it was customary to provide food for the journey, called *viaticum*. In the Roman Church an exaggerated view of the elements associated this name with the administration of the rite with holy

unction for the dying, as a safeguard through death. Though the Lord's Supper is no passport to heaven, in life's pilgrimage it affords a vantage ground for a retrospective view of our own winding path, and for an anticipated abiding triumph through the uplifted Christ. May the hush of this Communion season afford a moment of sweet repose to review the past and to gather new inspiration for that which is to come.

The Supper has been likened to the "pleasant arbor," in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, midway up "the Hill Difficulty," regarding which "Mercy" said, "How good is the Prince of pilgrims to provide such resting-places for them." For new burdens we need rest and renewed strength. At the head of Glencoe, Argyll-shire, there is a seat on which there is inscribed, "Rest and be Thankful,"[1] to which Wordsworth refers in one of his sonnets—

> "Doubling and doubling with laborious walk,
> Who that has gained at length the wished-for height,
> This brief, this simple wayside call can slight,
> And rest not thankful?"

From that settle the sublime scenery of the winding path down the wild Highland glen imparts a note of triumph for the ascending of the towering heights beyond. In like manner the Lord's Supper foreshadows the Christian's final experience, when (in the inimitable words of Rev. W. Williams, Pantycelyn) life's pilgrimage will be reviewed from Zion's happy heights.[2]

[1] Rev. Charles Jerdan, LL.B., *For the Lord's Table*, p. 263, 1899.

[2]

Hymn.	Translation.
"O fryniau Caersalem ceir gweled Holl daith yr anialwch i gyd;	From Salem's heights holy celestial

(Continued on next page)

CHRISTMAS

The end of the old and the beginning of the new year are important terminals, impressive because they are passing segments of invisible cycles, which prophesy the vanishing character of all temporal institutions and partake of the mystery which attaches to incompleted providences. As we contemplate the flitting years it is heartening to think of Christ—the continuing influence and unifying power which runs through the ages. And at this particular time it is profitable to consider the unchangeable character and abiding helpfulness of the Lord's Supper. The unchangeable Christ and unfailing love are both the foundation and superstructure of this memorial. United in Jesus the household of faith in all ages forms one extended communion. For two millenniums the Lord's Supper has been celebrated with unbroken regularity, notwithstanding difficulties and danger; and shall continue unfailingly until the Lord of the Supper shall come again, for He said, "Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world."

Hymn.	Translation.
Pryd Hyn daw troion yr yrfa	Our wilderness path we'll review;
Ynfelys i lanw ein bryd;	The course with its windings terrestrial
Cawn edrych ar stormydd, ac ofnau,	So sweetly my soul will renew;
Ac angau dychrynllyd a'r bedd,	Delivered from storms once encountered
A ninnau'n ddiangol o'u cyrhaedd	From terrors of death and the grave
Yn nofio mewn cariad a hedd."	Serenely above them transported
	In peace upon love's tranquil wave.

(In the translation assistance was derived from the translations of Mr. Owen Morris and Mr. J. W. Williams.)

"All the days" presupposes some days of trial and some days of discouragement and apparent loneliness, but to the eye of faith Christ is present, and manifests Himself, by His spirit to comfort, by His word to enlighten, by His people to testify, and by His ordinances to bless.

The inimitable majesty of the divine in this institution has perpetuated it and enabled it to enlist the divine in our own nature. It is this that has given it permanency and unchangeableness, and made it capable of calling forth unselfish devotion in all ages. The divine element has not only enabled it to survive opposition, but also to acquire increasing hold upon the hearts of men, while other religious rites and systems have vanished. Christ has established a kingdom which cannot be moved, and He Himself is enthroned in more loving hearts to-day than ever before, and the Supper survives. To celebrate the Lord's Supper in the early centuries involved the danger of persecution and death, and would not be continued were it not the memorial of a Savior's death. Before Christianity was a hundred years old it was consecrated and glorified by the blood of many martyrs. The central thought of the communion is Jesus Christ, and He holds the affection of the world, because as a Savior He fulfills the deepest desires of the human heart, and commends Himself to us by the purity of His life, the sacrifice of His love, and the assurance of His presence. Our coming to this table week after week connects us with the Upper Room, and by our communions we become a part of the memory chain which is only to end with our Lord at His coming. May our partaking give us, not merely

a transient thought of the Master, but an extended communion with a better understanding of His love and sympathy.

SELF-EXAMINATION

(End of the year)

As when a candle goes out suddenly and in the dark limits us to ourselves, so the end of the year brings us to self-examination. On the last Lord's Day of the year I can think of no more apppropriate Scripture than the injunction of the apostle Paul, "But let a man examine (or prove) himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup."[1]

Self-examination was an essential part of apostolic communion and its importance has been recognized throughout the centuries, even while primitive practice has been transformed and weekly communion abandoned. In Scotland the Seceders observed the Lord's Supper once a year only, until the middle of the eighteenth century, when as a result of an urgent appeal by the Rev. John Brown, of Haddington, it became customary to celebrate it twice a year.[2] But what they lacked in frequency they tried to make up in consecration, for they then (as well as those now having monthly communion) held a "preparation," generally on Friday, in order to make heart preparation for the feast.

Do we now give the time, thought, and devotion we should to self-preparation and self-examination? As Disciples of Christ we respect the letter of the gospel, but our weekly communion should inspire us to be

[1] 1 Cor. 11:28.

[2] John Brown, D.D., *Discourses Suited to the Lord's Supper*, p. vi.

the best interpreters of the sacraments, and the best exemplars of their spirit and fruit. If we come to this table with hearts unattuned, we will find ourselves out of harmony with our Lord and will go away unblessed. If we would eat and drink worthily, we must examine ourselves, so as to come to this table with that discriminating faith which will "discern the Lord's body," so as to quicken our sluggish hearts at the foot of the cross. The self-examination of communion is for a special purpose, that we may not "eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily," but may have such a rehearsal of the passion as to "discern the body," for intimate communion with the Master. This does not mean that we are not to have other self-examinations. But there is no more appropriate time for special and general self-examination than the end of the year. But self-examination is not altogether a review, for retrospection naturally ends in introspection. This is the time for invoicing, but that does not necessarily imply suspension of business, but rather the securing and enlarging of the foundation for future activity. Our self-examination should not be an adjustment of ourselves to the past, but rather the verifying of our bearings for that which is ahead. As the sundial must behold the sun, so must our self-examination put us in relation to and in communion with Him who is to illuminate our hearts.

The apostle's injunction was to believers, consequently our inquiry should be, not as to whether we are Christians, but rather what sort of Christians. Self-examination is not to qualify us to be worthy to eat, but to eat in a worthy manner; it does not expect perfection, but seeks consistency and loyalty of pur-

pose. Paul expected that if we "discern the body" the sense of spiritual reciprocity would kindle thanksgiving that would move us likewise to offer our "bodies a living sacrifice."

Before the passover the Israelites put away all leaven from their houses, carefully searching all their dwellings with a candle, say the Rabbis. In like manner, "let us keep the feast, not with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.[1]"

If self-examination is solemn and somewhat depressing, remember that the purpose of self-examination is not to deter any from partaking, but that we may partake worthily, or in a worthy manner. We are not to establish a claim to our worthiness, for then who could partake? Self-examination in the face of our unworthiness should fill us with thanksgiving and inspire us to the best endeavor:

> "Awake, my soul, stretch every nerve
> And press with vigor on."

A NEW YEAR'S COMMUNION

We have come to-day to a new boundary, the first communion in the twentieth century. New boundaries necessitate new inquiries, for all that is significant is not always obvious. I had not realized that the facets of a diamond were anything more than embellishments until Prof. C. F. Chandler, of York, showed me how diamonds are specially cut to advantageously refract the rays of light, and thus increase their own brilliancy. In like manner life's

[1] 1 Cor. 5: 8.

measure is not simply an aggregation of years, but the annual facets should enhance life's character, and with purity of purpose bring out the soul's lustre.

The steps which have brought us to the threshold of this new era mark the footprints of the steady march of time, and project us upon the shadows of our own departure. The communion at this special time makes us feel, in a small degree, the visions which pressed upon our Lord at the Last Supper, viz., the brevity of life and the longing that love and sacrifice be remembered.

The survey of the centuries affords no higher ideal for living than the truth and hope proclaimed by Jesus Christ. It was Christianity that recommended the golden rule. It was Christ who gave the New Commandment, and in a selfish age enjoined the love which seeketh not her own. There can be no more exalted fellowship than that which enjoined believers to bear one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ. Christianity upholds our best hopes and aspirations, and the moment we abandon it we confront sadness and despair. If we distrust Christ and His resurrection our preaching is vain and our faith also is vain. Preaching came into the world with Christ, and without Him there is nothing to preach. Heathendom before Christ had its priests, but it had no preaching, for it had no Savior. Distrust Christ and you destroy the One through whom every prayer ascends and every pardon descends. Without Him life becomes an enigma, and our hope of future life has no better assurance than that of Socrates and Cicero, who like ourselves hoped to live again. But the fact that we desire a hereafter is no absolute proof of it.

It is wholly beside the subject to prophesy what the evolution of the race is going to be, for science predicts nothing as to the individual. Out of Christ destiny is a mystery. The shadows of death and the powers of the world to come drive us to Him who said: "I am the resurrection and the life." "Because I live ye shall live also." Christ emphasized the immortality of the individual and constituted us joint-heirs of His glory. The church by its ordinances, worship, and spiritual influences endeavors to fashion the spiritual man after the image of Him who is immortal. The communion is a fitting time at the beginning of the year to form exalted resolutions and invoke renewed strength.

THE COMMUNION HYMN

"When they had sung a hymn"

I am reminded to-day of the last thing that Matthew and Mark said of the Last Supper, viz., "When they had sung a hymn they went out unto the Mount of Olives." The hymn chanted probably was the last part of the Hallel, or Psalms 115–118, which it was customary to sing at the passover (after the fourth cup of wine).[1]

There are two thoughts reflected in this Scripture, communion and parting. The hymn was a part of the spirit and experience of the communion. The circumstances were conducive for those whose love had mingled in the Supper to blend their voices in the song, for it had been a night of hallowed remembrances, intimate fellowship, and new and unexpected

[1] The first part of the Hallel, consisting of Psalm 113 and 114, was commonly sung before the meal.

benedictions, but the future was full of gloom and perplexity. The unfriendly forebodings had pressed the little company very close together. Doubtless there were heavy hearts that night leaning on Him who bore the world's burden, but there is no intimation that the hymn was a dirge or lament. It was the customary Hallel, a refrain full of praise and thanksgiving. We wonder that the darkest night in human history, when our Lord was about to be betrayed by Judas, condemned by Pilate, and when He was facing His own cross, should have any song at all. Yet there is nothing like sacred melody to quiet the troubled heart and lift the soul unto the realm of perfect peace.

The hymn singing and going out from the first communion table foreshadowed the Church rejoicing in her experience and fellowship, going forth to the new activities and triumphs of life, though Gethsemane and Calvary be near. "They sang a hymn and went out," and never again did they meet for a similar communion.

Like that of the primitive disciples, in some respects, our parting hymn also reflects the feelings and friendship of pastor and people resulting from three busy years of harmonious companionship, and our going out is significant and confronted with new problems. The thought that we have planned together, and worked together, and shared the best of each other's hearts, adds a tremor to our music to-day.

It is only occasionally that we can get deep down into our own feelings. It is only by the help of each other that we can get at our own selves. There is

some gold in every heart, and it has its glow, when the communion hymn and parting thought removes the drift and sod that conceal it. The discovery of a kindred spirit is the greatest joy of the heart, and to sever the ties of friendship is the saddest moment of life. There is something in every soul that appreciates the harmony of sweet companionship, which says with Peter: "It is good to be here, and let us make three tabernacles" and prolong pleasant communings. But while duties and victories are ahead, our communions must be conferences, and our hymns but marching songs, for the Master says, "Arise, let us go hence," John 14:31. We lift our voices in praises and our hearts in prayer.

"It is a temptation which grows stronger the longer we live to look back instead of forward, to lavish sentiment on the past, deride the present, and distrust the future."[1] Our communions are full of retrospection and remembrance, but will fail of their fullest purpose unless they strengthen and inspire us for a better future. Thankful then for that which we have enjoined together we go out to-day, and our feet turn to different missions and new burdens, but let us follow Him whose love brought us together, and let the memories of our friendship remind us of the bounties of His grace. Let us take the Master into hearts which have been purified and enlarged by human friendship. Though we may have no Gethsemane before us, we have tribulations which need the companionship, guidance, and cheer of Him who said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee," Heb. 13:5.

[1] Rev. Hugh Black, M.A., *Friendship*, p. 114.

Our communions have their incidents and partings, but Christ is the essential and abiding part of all. Though the Church has had sorrow upon sorrow, but because it has its living Christ, and undying hope, it has kept its communions and sung its hymns in all ages.[1]

THE LORD'S SUPPER AND THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

The Lord's Supper holds an historic place among the Disciples of Christ. The origin of their movement dates from a circumstance connected with its celebration, which records the almost incredibly intolerant spirit of the time. Their practice of its weekly observance has been a factor in the preservation of their weak and pastorless churches, and has continued to voice their original appeal for the restoration of the essentials of apostolic Christianity in faith and practice.

In the twofold origin of the Disciples of Christ, on the one hand through Thomas and Alexander Campbell, and on the other through Barton W. Stone, the *Lord's Supper* and *Evangelism* are the two words that gave cohesion and expansion to the movement.

We aim here to give a synopsis only of the move-

[1] "Nothing mean, nothing unclean has any admittance here; we taste first of prayer to God before we sit down to meat; we eat only what suffices nature, and drink no more than what is strictly becoming chaste and regular persons. We satisfy appetite as those who know that they must wake in the night to the service of God, and discourse as those who remember that they are in the hearing of their Master. When supper is ended and we have washed our hands and the lights are brought in, every one is invited to sing praises to God, either such as he collects from the Holy Scriptures, or such as are of his own composing." Tertullian, *Apol.* 39.

ment in relation to the Lord's Supper. On account of ill-health Thomas Campbell was advised in 1807 to take a sea voyage and visit America. After locating in Pennsylvania as a minister of the Presbyterian Church, he was commissioned to visit some scattered members who lived on the Alleghany River above Pittsburgh. He was accompanied by Mr. Wilson, a young minister, with whom he was to hold a communion service. He felt sorry for the people, who were isolated by religious divisions, in a new country, and consequently seldom enjoyed the privilege of the Lord's Supper, therefore he invited all, irrespective of party differences, who felt themselves duly prepared, to partake.[1] Mr. Wilson did not protest at the time, but later preferred charge against Mr. Campbell to the Presbytery, in the form of "libell," containing various formal and specified charges, the chief of which was that he had failed to adhere to the church

---

[1] There is a fascination in the history of the efforts of Thomas Campbell in behalf of Christian Union. He was in line with voices which were heard in different parts of the world, about the close of the 18th century, calling for more religious freedom and closer union of Christians. There was a reaction against creeds as the instruments of division and barriers to fellowship, and credal theology was extensively repudiated with an appeal to return to New Testament basis and the simplicity of the apostolic age.

The seceder Church of which Mr. Campbell was a member in Ireland was divided into four branches, and the branch to which he belonged was particularly bigoted. It excommunicated one man for hearing the preaching of James Haldane and Rowland Hill, and disciplined a stone-mason for doing work on an Episcopal chapel!

Though the movement under Barton W. Stone, which began in 1801, was the earlier; the contribution of the Campbells through their better education and wider publicity (especially by the debates of A. Campbell), was more definite and comprehensive. But both were the same in principles and aim.

standard and usages, and he also disapproved of his bearing towards them. It should be said that all those invited by Mr. Campbell were Presbyterians, but belonged to different branches of the family; but it is also fair to add that the Presbyterians of the present day would have fully approved of his action.

The Presbytery took up the accusation against Thomas Campbell and interrogated him. He was thus put on the defensive, and in order not to break fellowship endeavored to be conciliatory, but held that he had violated no principle of the Sacred Volume, and plead in vain for Christian liberty and fraternity. In the end the Presbytery found him deserving of censure for not adhering to the "Secession Testimony."

Against this decision Mr. Campbell appealed to the Synod. As it was impossible for him to retract or apologize, he submitted a courteous statement to clarify his position. The Synod decided that "there were such informalities in the proceedings of the Presbytery in the trial of the case, as to afford sufficient reason to the Synod to set aside the judgment and decision and to release the protestor from the censure inflicted by the Presbytery." Notwithstanding this the case was referred later to a committee, which reported unjustly that Mr. Campbell's answers were "evasive," "unsatisfactory," and "highly equivocal" upon great and "important articles of revealed religion" and different from the sentiment professed by the Church, and affording "sufficient ground to infer censure."

The action of the Synod was a great disappointment to Mr. Campbell, but in order to avoid schism

he concealed his grievance. But soon the action was followed by acts of persecution and false accusations by spies, so that he was eventually obliged to "decline all ministerial connection with, or subject to, the Associated Synod of N. America." Many friends, knowing of the unfair treatment he had received and sharing his ideas of reform, encouraged him to use his ministry for the conciliation of a divided Church. There was no intention to start a new church, but that the public might understand the basis and method of Christian Union, he wrote the *Declaration and Address* as the constitution of the "Christian Association of Washington, Pa.," which was formed August 7, 1809, for the purpose of promoting "simple evangelical Christianity, free from all mixture of human opinions and inventions of men."

They at first sought to make their plea inside the other churches, but were soon forced out of these by the intolerance and prejudices of the times. But let it be said, to the everlasting credit of the men who started this movement, that they did not permit themselves through ambition or any other motive to attempt to start another church, which should be called after them; but in an undenominational spirit organized congregations for fellowship, worship, and work.

In their passion for Union they refused to be separated by the questions and controversies that separated the churches, and to avoid sectarianism discouraged the employment of theological terminology, and proposed the Bible as a book of authority instead of the creeds[1] and to "use Bible names for

[1] They all looked upon creeds as instruments of sectarian divisions, but some seriously questioned, Can a church possibly hold together

Bible themes," and hold simply to the fundamental and evangelical truths of Jesus Christ and conform

without a written creed? And it was to answer these negations that Thomas Campbell set forth his historic dictum: "*Where the Scriptures speak we speak, and where the Scriptures are silent we are silent.*"

THE MOVEMENT. In breaking with sectarianism, for cohesion among themselves they emphasized the essentials of Christianity, and gave first place to the supremacy of Christ, and made the open confession and acceptance of him as Savior, the essential evidence of conversion and ground of fellowship; as expressed in Peter's confession: "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God." Isaac Errett said: "To persuade men to trust and love and obey the divine Savior is the one great end for which we labor in preaching the gospel; assured that if men are right about Christ, Christ will bring them right about everything else." (*Our Position.*) In matters of faith and salvation Christ is the finality of God's revelation, and acknowledging his supremacy our fathers declined to wear any other Name than His.

And secondly, notwithstanding divisions, Thomas Campbell already stated in the *Declaration and Address*, that "the Church of Jesus Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one." And to find its model, it was proposed to go back, not simply to the Oecumenical Councils and their decrees, but to the New Testament, for the teachings and example of Jesus and the apostles. For as the Old Testament was the law and authority for the Old Testament Church, so is the New Testament the constitution and guide of the Church of the New Dispensation. Therefore it was maintained that "Nothing ought to be received into the faith and worship of the Church, or be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament." And to find the lost unity of the Church they made a plea to go back "fairly and firmly to original ground, and take up things just as the apostles left them." And so intent were they on following the apostolic program, that they sincerely declared that there was nothing which they themselves received as matter of faith and practice that they would not heartily relinquish if not expressly taught and enjoined in the word of God. They recognized that the life of the Church is not in theology but in religion; consequently they desired to "inculcate none other things than those very articles of faith and holiness expressly revealed and enjoined in the word of God"; and counselled that the Church in its "administrations should keep close by the observance of all Divine ordinances after the example of the primitive church."

the life to His life, so as rightly to be disciples of Christ.

In their desire to purify the faith and worship of the Church they advocated the restoration of the teaching and practice of the apostolic age.

The Breaking of Bread. In the revival meetings of that day the evangelists did not regard their work complete, when a group were converted, until they were organized and "set in order" as a church. For they remembered that the great commission said, not only "make and baptize" disciples, but also "teach them to observe all things which I have commanded you." And one of the things commanded the apostles was this memorial Supper, and which became the central event in the primitive observance of the Lord's Day.

It may be said for the Disciples of Christ that weekly communion brought them to apostolic ground, and became a rallying point for congregational life of immense benefit to the movement. Whether "rain or shine," preacher or no, "the disciples met on the first day of the week to break bread." They looked forward to the celebration of the Supper on the Lord's Day as an essential part of the worship, and Sunday became not rightly observed without it. In a simple, plain homily a good elder, or some other respected brother appointed, talked to the company, exhorting them to faithfulness and worthy conduct as the family of God, reminding them how our Lord had expected that the Breaking of Bread, with its loving remembrance, should always be a tie between Himself and His disciples, and the memory of His exemplary life an uplifting ideal, and His promised presence a sign of

victory "till he come." As an event of sacred privilege it drew the people to church, and inculcating greater consecration and closer fellowship became the means of saving weak and pastorless churches from disbanding.

As to the Disciples' attitude towards inter-communion, the fathers were accustomed to say "we neither invite or debar," thereby assuming that communion is a privilege and partaking an individual responsibility. That neutral attitude may have been correct while we were affiliated with the Baptists, but surely it does not express the fraternal welcome and cordial invitation which the Disciples extend to-day to all who feel duly prepared to share with them in the table fellowship. Personally I would go still further, for since the inter-communion of Thomas Campbell was a factor in our birth, and as we still continue to be the foremost advocates of Christian Union, I favor making our Convention Communions and Union-Communions with sister churches in towns and villages agencies for promoting comity and Christian Union. In such communions, where many of different faith are expected, I can see no objection, without creating an actual liturgy, if the service were somewhat elaborated, or lengthened, to be more acceptable to those accustomed to monthly and liturgical celebrations. But in the celebration of the Lord's Supper all will agree that the less of signals and ceremonies the better; yet Scripture and patristic literature disclose that in the early Church a religious service with specific exercises prepared the minds of the faithful for the breaking of bread. For Union-Communions and special Convention Communions we would suggest some such order as this:

ORDER OF SERVICE

Organ Prelude	
Hymn	
Invocation	
The Lord's Prayer	By the Congregation
(Doxology)	
Old Testament Lesson—a Psalm	
New Testament Lesson	
Hymn	
Prayer for the Church Universal	
Communion Homily	By the Presiding officer
Thanksgiving for the Bread	By a Fellow-minister, or elder
Thanksgiving for the Cup	By a Fellow-minister, or elder
Recital of the words of institution	By the Presiding officer
Distribution	
Offertory	
Hymn	
Benediction	

There is an agitation among the Disciples of Christ to-day for a more faithful observance of the Lord's Supper. In many of our congregations the service has been abbreviated to a mere custom, with simply thanksgivings for the elements and no homily. But the *Table-talk* is essential to an effective communion and affords opportunity to confirm the faith and re-enlist the zeal of believers. It occupied a special place in the Last Supper of our Lord (John 13–17); and Alexander Campbell appreciated its importance so greatly as to make a special provision for it in preparing the *Christian System*. As a student at Bethany College, I recall that the Communions of the Bethany Church (perpetuating probably the order of service instituted by the Campbells), under the eldership of President W. K. Pendleton, Professor Charles Louis Loos, and Dr. Robert Richardson, were models of

simplicity and spiritual communings, and invariably with a brief homily emphasized some precious lesson of the love of Christ.

To restore to the Communion its original hold upon our people it must be made more historic, meaningful, and helpful. This will require for it a more rightful place and more preparation on the part of those in charge. The homily must have its old place with words of loving remembrance to open the heart for the blessed Savior. The presiding officers must learn to say a great deal in few words, and vary the lessons of each communion, so that each celebration with unfailing preparation will be a worshipful, happy, and impressively beneficial service.

Part II

CRITICAL DISSERTATIONS

PROBLEMS OF THE TEXT

The words of the institution of the Lord's Supper as found in 1 Cor. 11:23–25, Mark 14:22–25, and Matt. 26:26–29, are so well attested by the best manuscripts that their genuineness presents no textual doubt. But the text as found in Luke 22:14–21 forms one of the most difficult problems of textual criticism.

Luke 22:14–21[1]

14 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ
15 εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ'
16 ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό, ἕως ὅτου
17 πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστή-
18 σας εἶπε, Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν
ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως ὅτου ἡ
19 βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτο ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. [x]τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον·
20 Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ
τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί
21 μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον. πλὴν ἰδού, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος
με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς Τραπέζης.

The question of the original text acquired prominence by the publication of Westcott and Hort's

[1] The Revisers Text, according to the edition of Professor Alexander Souter, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Oxford, 1910.

[x] om. τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον . . . ἐκχυννόμενον

16 *post nunc versum legunt transposita ex vers.* 19 καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον . . . τὸ σῶμά μου 𝔏 (vt. [b e]): 𝔖 (vt.) (Diat.) *vero huc totum versum* 19 *transposuit* [17, 18] om. 𝔖 (vg.) 𝔉 (boh. *cod., qui v* 16 *quoque om.*) [19 20] τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. . . . . ἐκχυνόμενον *codd. Graec. et verss. fere omn.* Tert. *vel* Mcion Eus. "Can". Cyr. (*ex* 1 Cor. xi. 23b–25): *om.* D𝔏 (vt. [a e al].) 20 *vers. om.* 𝔖 (vt.) (*vide adn. ad v.* 16)

New Testament in the Original Greek, in 1881, which rejected vv. 19b, 20, by a double bracket, as interpolation.[1] Their brackets were based on the belief in a theory of "Western Non-Interpolations,"[2] behind which they assumed the existence of an unedited "Neutral text"; but the progress of textual criticism has modified both suppositions, and questions increasingly their distortion of the Lord's Supper, according to their text of the Third Gospel. Though the W-H text makes Luke to disagree with the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, and also with Paul, and gives an interrupted and questionable reading, their great authority is accepted as final by many able critics; while other scholars of note regard their brackets unfortunate as tending indirectly to give certainty to the Western text, which after all is only a disputed and unsatisfactory reading. It is generally conceded that some of the puzzling differences of Greek Codices and early versions which have baffled New Testament scholars have not had their final word, and may need perchance the discovery of new material for textual critics to make more extended collations.

In the investigation of a passage where the variants date from an early age, as in this case, manuscripts

---

[1] 19 καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου [[(τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου. τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον]].

[2] "Those Western omissions therefore which we can confidently accept as, properly speaking, non-interpolations are marked by double brackets [[ ]]; while those about which there is a reasonable doubt are marked by simple bracket [ ]." Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek,* Vol. ii, p. 294, 1881.

and versions are examined and compared to ascertain their age, trustworthiness, and patristic evidence in order to determine by the canons of criticism whether the discrepancy is the result of omission, interpolation, or conflation.

The key-words of the institution of the Lord's Supper suggest the question: Did the apostles deliver the primal sections of the Gospels as oral lessons in the assemblies of the primitive church,[1] to be in turn transmitted by catechists to early converts, before these paragraphs were committed to writing?[2] In that case the oral lessons (like communion addresses) would sacrifice chronology to lesson-groupings, and would aim to promote spiritual effect rather than chronological accuracy.

The Lord's Supper Instituted

A compressed account of the institution of the Lord's Supper in its order of enactment is given by Paul and the Synoptists. The four narratives sustain a uniform conception, notwithstanding several minor differences. In construction the four traditions form

[1] "The earliest Christian teaching, . . . was oral. It was from the living voice that men first heard the story of Christ." George Milligan, D.D., *The New Testament Documents*, p. 129, 1913.

[2] Sir William M. Ramsay states that, "so far as antecedent probability goes, founded on the general character of the preceding and contemporary Greek, or Græco-Asiatic society, the first Christian account of the circumstances connected with the death of Jesus must be presumed to have been written in the year when Jesus died." *Letters To The Seven Churches Of Asia*, p. 5, 1904.

"I am fully convinced that the main source of the Synoptic Gospels was a single written document." F. C. Burkitt, M. A., *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, p. 34ff., 1906.

two groups, Mark and Matthew on the one hand, and Paul and Luke on the other.

Mark—Matthew

Mark 14:22-24, Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, Λάβετε. τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς[k] διαθήκης τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.

[k] add. καινῆς

Matthew 26:26-28, Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπε, Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. 27 καὶ λαβὼν[1] ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 28 Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ [m]τῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

[1] add. τὸ [m] add. καινῆς

Analysis of the Mark–Matthew Tradition

The order of enactment and phraseology of the two narratives are identical, if balanced with the following equivalents and amplifications: to the λάβετε of Mark (not recorded by Paul and Luke), Matthew adds φάγετε; for the Markan καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, Matthew gives the bidding words of Christ πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες; for the ὑπὲρ πολλῶν of Mark, Matthew has περὶ πολλῶν, followed with the important declaration (perhaps editorial),[1] that the outpouring of Christ's blood is designedly εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ("for the remission of sins").

Unquestionably the twofold narratives of Mark and Matthew represent the practice of the Palestinian

[1] "The judgment frequently pronounced that it is a liturgical addition, contains a *petitio principii*, as this expression, ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, is searched for in vain in the whole of the Old Testament, as well as in the Old Testament Apocrypha, so that it is necessary to explain first how this could be a liturgical term which is also found in Paul Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14, &c." A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Parralleltexte zu Lukas*, S. 655, Leipzig, 1895.

church during the latter half of the first century,[1] when the Gospels were written, and as written accounts reflect belief which was current somewhat earlier, through which the sacramental character of the Supper is traced to its first coinage.[2] Covering a period still earlier as well as somewhat later Paul and Luke corroborate the same, so that it may be accepted as the general practice of Christians, not only on Jewish soil, but throughout the Roman world during the first century.

There is a tendency among some modern critics to restrict the Last Supper to the compass of Mark's Gospel, and to compress Luke's narrative through Westcott and Hort's brackets to the same abbreviations. This is unfair, for it is generally conceded that Luke had a separate and more ample source than Mark for his passion-narrative.[3]

[1] George Salmon, D.D., *The Human Element in the Gospel*, p. 490, 1907.

[2] The most reliable authorities maintain that 1 Corinthians was written at the end of Paul's three years' ministry at Ephesus 57 A. D. (Hastings' D. B. i, p. 486). Likewise, by the same authority Mark is assigned to 63–67 A. D. (Vol. iii, p. 261); Matthew to 66–70 A. D. (iii, p. 304). That may stand perhaps for Matthew's Aramaic Gospel, and for Proto-Luke, but both Matthew and Luke in their present form may be no earlier than 75 A. D.

[3] Burkitt says: "When the Evangelist comes to the Last Supper itself he has other material. From this point the Gospel of Mark is no longer the basis of his narrative. . . . We have seen that Luke does not, as a rule, disturb the relative order of the sources which he employs, and so the question arises whether this narrative of the Passion may not have been derived from the same source as most of Luke's non-Markan material, i. e., from Q itself." *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 134, 1906.

See also, Sir John C. Hawkins, M.A., *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 29–138, 1911. Alfred Morris Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, pp. 31–55, Chicago, 1920.

Paul—Luke

1 Cor. 11:23-25, Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον, 24 καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ εἶπε, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν[q]. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν 25 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσακις ἂν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

[q] add. κλώμενον

Luke 22:14-20, Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. 15 καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. 16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό, ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς. 18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. 19 καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου [x] τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.

[x] om. τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον... ἐκχυνόμενον

The Paul–Luke Compared With the Mark–Matthew Traditions

In language and arrangement the narratives of Paul and Luke exhibit marked similarity, yet their individuality seems to be sufficient to establish their validity as independent witnesses.

As contrasted with Matthew and Mark, their affinity is seen by the manner in which they fix the time of the Supper, for Paul states that it was "in the night in which he was betrayed," (ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο); and Luke introduces it by the specified Passover hour, (ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα κ.τ.λ.). They also show preference for εὐχαριστήσας to express the blessing for the loaf instead of εὐλογήσας, and announce specifically that the cup was "after supper" (the passover part of the meal),[1] and preceded by similar thanksgiving

[1] "The fact that ἄρτον nowhere has the article and that ποτήριον is

as for the loaf, ὡσαύτως . . . . μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι. Though they lack the invitation "Take" (λάβετε), and "Drink" (πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες) recorded in Matthew 26: 28, they both corroborate the Mark–Matthew tradition in emphasising the cup as the instrument of the covenant (by καινὴ διαθήκη). While Matthew and Mark represent the elements as symbols of a sacrificial death and a covenant feast, they omit the phrase by which Paul and Luke have imparted to the Supper its institutional and memorial character, viz., "This do in remembrance of me" (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν).

The Mark–Matthew tradition is too much abbreviated to denote the stages of the Passover ritual, but the fuller account of Luke (Antiochian text) indicates that towards the close of the national feast, when the passover had been eaten, the words and acts of the Last Supper were introduced.[1]

The Lucan Western Text Compared With the Marcan–Matthæan

Luke's Western text (Codex D), upheld by W-H, is coloring the views of many modern scholars who assume a negative attitude towards traditional Chris-

---

found without it in Matthew and Mark rather encourages the conjecture that when it is found with the article in the Lucan parallel the addition is significant. If so, it can only mean to suggest a contrast between the cup of v. 17, which is merely 'a cup,' 'a paschal cup' and the cup of v. 20, which is 'the cup, the Lord's Supper cup." H. Mc. A. Robinson, *The Princeton Theological Review*, p. 622, October, 1910.

[1] "It was during the later stages, after the lamb had been eaten and while it still preoccupied all minds, that the words and acts took place which we usually denote by the term 'the Last Supper.'" J. V. Bartlet, M.A., *Mansfield College Essays*, p. 46, 1909.

tianity.[1] We say this simply to emphasize the importance of the inquiry.

The Western text has the introductory verses 15–19a the same as the *Textus Receptus*. It gives the cup and bread, but reverses the order of their use as found in the other Gospels and in Paul; but instead of the "blessing" (εὐλογήσας) for the bread of Mark–Matthew, it agrees with the "given thanks" (εὐχαριστήσας) of St. Paul. While the words at the giving of the bread are in agreement with Mark, those connected with the cup are very different, and absolutely silent as to its meaning.

The Western text represents the Last Supper as a rite exclusively for the twelve disciples, for of the cup it says, "Divide it among yourselves" (διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς). Those who adopt the reading of W–H regard the cup of v. 17 as taking the place of the Mark–Matthew cup, but omit the sacramental declaration, "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many." (Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.) This omission according to one account, and the insertion of the distribution of the bread according to the other, are inexplicable. It seems better not to identify the two cups, but to regard "a cup" (v. 17) one of the paschal cups, and not "the cup" sacramental of v. 20.

The answer these variants supply to the question, What meaning did our Lord attach to His own death? reflects some light on the solution of the differences. Those who follow the W–H text regard the Last Supper only an ordinary meal, and find in it an aban-

[1] William Healey Cadman, B.D., *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, Oxford, 1923.

doned purpose; for to them, "With desire I have desired to keep this Passover with you before I suffer," is only an expression of disappointment, and a declaration of regret that on account of the betrayal He would "not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine" though the Passover was to be celebrated the next evening. But as Plummer observes, "There is nothing in any of the accounts to prevent us from supposing that Jesus drank before handing the cup (v. 17) to the others."[1] And without Paschal connection and a sacramental supper it is difficult to ascribe intelligent meaning to the declaration, "This is my body." And it appears arbitrary to leave out of account the significant meaning, "shed for many" of the "blood of the covenant," preserved in the other Synoptists.[2] If His death was not for "many" (πολλῶν), it is doubtful that He would have enjoined a repetition of the Supper, saying, "This do in remembrance of me," which is undisputably attested by St. Paul. If He was simply addressing the twelve, and dying only for them, any reference to a "covenant" is ambiguous, and the Western text in this passage appears to discredit Christianity as interpreted by the immediate followers of our Lord.

The Traditions of Paul and Luke Contrasted

Luke had had many predecessors, and had consulted all written traditions (Luke 1:1–3). He was a traveler, and had been the companion of the Apostle

[1] J. F. Srawley, D.D., *Hastings E. R. E.*, Vol. v, p. 540, Edinburgh, 1912.

[2] Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D., *International Critical Comm. on Luke*, p. 496, New York, 1901.

to the Gentiles, and doubtless was familiar with his communion practice (compare Acts 20: 11 and 27: 35, where he was present); therefore we should expect agreement rather than difference between Luke and Paul.[1] It is possible that Paul the preacher was as indebted to Luke the historian, for the eucharistic tradition, as much as the latter was to Paul.

The distinguishing characteristics of Luke's narrative, as compared with Paul's, are the following:

(1) An introductory account, embracing the securing of the Upper Room by the two disciples, and the preparation of the feast (Luke 22: 1–13).

(2) The strife for pre-eminence while selecting the paschal seats (Luke 22: 24–28).

(3) Anticipation for the paschal celebration, the fulfillment of the last terrestrial passover (22: 15–17).

(4) The Father's kingdom as substitutive of the passover (22: 16–18).

All the foregoing is introductory to the eucharist.

(5) The eucharistic narratives show that Luke pursued an independent course, for after the bread was blessed and broken, Luke has, "and gave to them" (καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς) not found in Paul. Then introductory to "This is my body," Luke has λέγων ("saying"), agreeing in meaning but differing in form from εἶπεν ("he said"), found in all the other narratives. Likewise, the words, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου ("This is my body") of Luke, compared with the same given by Paul, τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα, are not easily explained if supposed to be copied from a written text,

[1] Ad. Lichtenstein, *Einsetzung des heiligen Abendmahles*, S. 17, Berlin, 1899. Arthur Wright, M.A., *St. Luke's Gospel in Greek*, Introduction, London, 1900.

since they are followed in Luke by τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον ("which is given for you"); of which διδομενον is found in no other eucharistic tradition, save this of Luke. The arrangement of the words, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως of Luke's is not uniform with Paul's ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον; while the declaration over the cup shows a still greater divergence, for the ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι of Paul, by omission and change has the parallel ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου in Luke followed by τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον ("which is poured out for you"), for which Paul has no equivalent. Besides, the Supper of Paul shows further development, in its name, κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, and its established place as an institution of the church, ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, a memorial celebrated jointly with the Agape, whose fellowship, κοινωνία, replaced the expectation of our Lord's immediate return, by the doctrine of communion with Him in the cup and loaf (1 Cor. 10: 16); and as contrasted with the table of demons, called for social purity and allegiance to Christ.

But an attempt to institute a minute comparison of the Supper as set forth by Luke and Paul involves a critical examination of the text of the Third Gospel and its authorities, which bifurcate here.[1] It is worthy of note that the Synoptic Problem had not been critically studied in the days of Westcott and Hort, and that modern research exalts the sources of Luke himself. It has been recently demonstrated by several scholars that the authors of the First and Third Gos-

[1] We should not forget that whichever text is adopted, every essential of the longer text has its analogue in the account, either of Paul, or of Matthew and Mark. And even if the Lucan narrative were eliminated entirely the genuineness of the Pauline account remains unquestioned.

pels had in common besides Mark's Gospel, another document which is designated by Q, a symbol derived from the German word for source (*Quelle*), representing the non-Marcan matter common to both Matthew and Luke.[1]

Sir John A. Hawkins has shown that there are two long sections, viz., Luke 6:20–8:3, and Luke 9:51–18:14, in which Luke makes no use of Mark at all. Also Luke's account of the Last Supper and Passion, 22:14–24:12, appears like an originally independent account enriched by occasional assimilation from Mark's document.

"The non-Marcan sections, taken all together, would form a complete gospel, beginning with the preaching of John and ending with the Resurrection Appearances. . . . To Matthew, Mark is the primary source and provides the framework into which matter from other sources is inserted. To Luke the non-Marcan document (Q–L)—Proto-Luke, as we may style it—is the primary authority, and forms the framework into which he fitted materials derived from Mark or from other sources."[2]

This was natural if Dr. Streeter's supposition is correct, that the author of Proto-Luke, combining together in one document materials from Q and other sources, oral or written, was no other than Luke himself, and that the compilation was made during the two years spent at Cæsarea, when Paul was imprisoned there.[3]

[1] Sir John A. Hawkins, *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 29–138, Oxford, 1911. Henry J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, Cambridge, 1920.

[2] Canon B. H. Streeter, *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 141–232, Oxford, 1911; and *Hibbert Journal*, p. 105, October, 1921.

[3] Canon B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

"Luke was not confined to Paul's preaching and Mark's Gospel. He knew James, the brother of Jesus (Acts 21:18), Manaen, a foster-brother of Herod (Acts 13:1), Joanna (Luke 8:3; 24:10), the wife

If thus, Proto-Luke was entirely independent of Mark, the validity of those portions which are distinctly Lucan should receive more weight, and since Luke was an adept in Christian origins (1:3), the supposition that the bracketed text is an interpolation from Paul becomes increasingly improbable.

Evidence of the Text-Forms Classified

The variants in the Lord's Supper account of Luke exhibit three text-forms:

(1) The Longer Text (ℵABCL), of the Textus Receptus, Tischendorf, Revised Version, and von Soden.

(2) The Shorter Text, called "Western," of Codex Bezae (D) and Old Latin Versions, *a*, *ff*, *i*, *l*.

(3) Harmonistic Texts, such as the Old Syriac and some Old Latin Versions (*b*, *e*), showing transpositions, abbreviations, and conflations.

(1) The Longer Text complete is sustained by all Greek Codices, including the lately discovered Freer Detroit manuscript designated W;[1] except the solitary Greek uncial D, all cursives and all versions, except those mentioned below. The Latin versions *c*, *f*, *q*, and Vulgate, give it complete, and likewise the Bohairic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions.[2]

---

of Herod's steward Chuza, who could tell much about the trial before Herod, as well as before Pilate. Luke knew Philip and his daughters at Cæsarea (Acts 21:8). During the two years at Cæsarea, Luke had abundant opportunity to secure full and precise information for his Gospel." A. T. Robertson, M.A., *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research*, p. 74, New York, 1920.

[1] Professor Henry A. Sanders, New Testament MSS. in the Freer Collection, Part I, 1912.

[2] A. Merx, *Die Vier Kanonischen Evangelien, Markus und Lucas*, S. 441ff., Berlin, 1905.

We also find fragments and special key-words of the Longer Text in several of the early fathers, which we shall include later in the discussion. If vv. 19b, 20 were interpolated from 1 Corinthians and Mark it must have occurred at a very early date, for the passage in its longer form was known to Tertullian (*Tert. adv. Marcion*, iv. 40); the Eusebian Canons, Cyril of Alexandria (*Comm. in Lucam*); and the Ethical Writings of Basilia[1] (Migne's *Patrologia Græca*, vol. 31, 619–1428); and to Justin Martyr, who apparently withheld a connected form of the eucharistic practice of his time, yet gave the essentials, including, "This do for my memorial" (*Apolog.* 1. 66, and Dial. *c. Tryph.* C. 70). We have further an illustration of the longer text expanded in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, viii. 12, pointing to early recognition of it in liturgical practice. There is this presumption in favor of the longer text, that it would be anomalous for a Gospel to interpolate from an Epistle, and for the corrupted text soon to become widely accepted.[2]

(2) The Shorter Text, omitting vv. 19b, 20, is sustained by Codex Bezae (D), and the Old Latin Versions *a*, *ff*, *i*, *l*.

Verses 16, 17, 18 are omitted in the text of the *Memphitic Catena*[3] (ed. de Lagarde, p. 17, Goettingen,

---

[1] *Basilius quae feruntur ethica.* Some of the "Ethical Writings" of Basilia are of doubtful origin. They are to be found in the Paris edition of Garnerius 1721–1730 fol. in vol. ii, 230–323; or in Migne's *Patrol. Græca*, vol. 31, 619–1428.

[2] Joh. Weiss, Meyer-Weiss *Komm. über Lukas*, S. 616, Goettingen, 1892.

[3] Titus, bishop of Bostra (Arabia Petrea), who died 378, A. D. (who is quoted in this Catena), in commenting included this passage, and thus reflected a Syriac version accepted in his time, somewhat

1886); and verses 17, 18, by *Lectionary* 32, and the *Peshitta*.

(3) Harmonistic Attempts, revealing much confusion.[1]

(a) We have 19a transposed before verse 17, and verse 20 omitted, as in *b* and *e*.

Codex Veronensis (*b*)

15 Et ait illis: Desiderio desideravi hoc Pascha Manducare vobiscum antequam patiar.
16 Dico enim nobis, quia ex hoc non manducabo illud donec . . . in regno Dei. 19 Et accepto pane, gratias egit, et fregit, et dedit illis, dicens: Hoc est corpus meum.
17 Et accepto calice, gratias egit, et dixit Accepite hoc et dividite inter vos. 18 dico enim vobis, quod non bibam de generatione hac vitis hujus, donec regnum Dei veniat.
21 Verumtamen ecce manus, etc.

Codex Palatinus (*e*)

15 Dixit ad illos: Concupiscentiam concupivi hoc Pascha manducare vobis priusquam patiar. 16 Dico enim nobis quia jam non manducabo illud doneque adimplear in regno dei. 19 et accepit panem et gratias egit et fregit et dedit eis dicens hoc est corpus meum. 17 Et accepit calicem et gratias egit et dixit: Accepite vivite inter vos. 18 dico enim vobis amodo non vivam amodo de potione vitis quoadusque regnum Dei veniat. 21 Verum, etc.

---

related to the Pesshita, but more abbreviated, as verse 16 is omitted. A. Merx, *op. cit.*, S. 440.

Whether "Titus" to whom the Catena refers is really bishop of Bostra, or whether the comments are his, needs an investigation. In the Greek Scholia attributed to him (edited by Professor Lickenberger), there is one on Luke 22: 16, but that is certainly spurious. The pseudo-Titus commentary on Luke (edited by Cramer), has no Scholia on these parts of the text.

[1] The Harmonistic variants are generally discredited, but they witness to the very early existence of the other two types of texts. W. Sanday, D.D., *Hastings' Dict. Bible*, Vol. ii, p. 637b, 1899.

Dean J. W. Blakesley was the first to suggest the originality of this text, but he closed his eyes to the strength of the adverse case. F. H. A. Scrivener, M.A., *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, Vol. ii, p. 353, London, 1894.

Synaitic Syriac[1]

15 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς. ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πάσχα πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν, 16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπάρτι οὐ (μὴ?) φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

19 Καὶ λαβὼν (τὸν?) ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου ὃ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν δίδωμι. Οὕτως ποιεῖτε (εἰς?) (τὴν?) ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20a Καὶ μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι 17 δεξάμενος or λαβὼν (τὸ?) ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἶπεν. λάβετε τοῦτο, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς, 20b Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου, διαθήκη καινή. 18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐ (μὴ?) πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ χαρποῦ τούτου ἕως ὅτου ἔλθῃ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ 21 Πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ κτλ.

Curetonian Syriac[1]

15 same as Syr. $^{\text{Sin.}}$.
16 same as Syr. $^{\text{Sin.}}$. ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.
19 same as Syr. $^{\text{Sin.}}$. τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. Οὕτως ποιεῖτε (εἰς?) (τὴν?) ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
20a om. 17 Καὶ δεξάμενος or λαβὼν (τὸ?) ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἶπεν· λάβετε τοῦτο. διαμερίσατε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. 20b om.
18 λέγω (without γὰρ) ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐ (μὴ?) πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως as Syr. $^{\text{Sin.}}$

Peshitta[1]

15 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν, 16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀπάρτι οὐ (μὴ?) φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

19 Καὶ λαβὼν (τὸν?) ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας (without ἐπ' αὐτῷ) ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔκωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς (τὴν?) ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 Καὶ ὡσαύτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι εἶπεν· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον διαθήκη καινὴ ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου (or ἐμῷ αἵματι) (or τὸ) ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννομένῳ (or ἐκχυννόμενον).

[1] Adalbert Merx, *Die Vier Kanonischen Evangelien, Markus und Lukas*, S. 434, 1905.

(b) We have more harmonizing attempts with transpositions; and v. 19 restored Syr. Cur, and next transpositions and conflations, with v. 20 restored in a divided form. Verses 16, 19, 17, 18, 21 are given by Syr. Cur. agreeing with *b* and *e* rather than with Syr. Sin, which gives 16, 19a, 20a, 18, 21.

In view of the general belief that Tatian's influence is widely found in the Western readings of the Old Syriac and Old Latin Versions, it is befitting here to give the text of the *Diatessaron*. For it may not be impossible that the Shorter Text owes its coinage to the paraphrase of Tatian's, which divides the Supper accounts into two paragraphs, separated by our Lord's table-talk, John 13: 21–30.

Diatessaron of Tatian.[1]

44	41	And when evening was come, and the time arrived, Jesus came and reclined, and the	Luke 22: 14.
	42	twelve apostles with him. And he said unto	Luke 22: 15.
	43	them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: I say unto you, that henceforth I shall not eat it, until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.	Luke 22: 16.
	44	Jesus said that, and was agitated in his spirit, and testified, and said,	John 13: 21a.
	45	Verily, verily, I say unto you, One of you, he that eateth with me, shall betray me, &c. . . .	Mark 14: 18. Mark 14: 22.
45	12	And while they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and divided; and gave to his	Matt. 26: 26.
	13	disciples, and said unto them, Take and eat; This is my body.	Mark 14: 23a.
	14	(Arabic) And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and blessed, and gave them, and (p. 171) said, Take and drink of it, all of you. And they drank of it, all of them. And he said unto	Matt. 26: 27. Mark 14: 23b.
	15	them, This is my blood, the new covenant,	Mark 14: 24.

[1] *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Edinburgh, 1903.

that is shed for many for the forgiveness of
16 sins. I say unto you, I shall not drink hence- Matt. 26: 28.
forth of this, the juice of the vine, until the Matt. 26: 29.
day in which I drink with you new wine in
17 the kingdom of God. And thus do ye in re- Luke 22: 19b.
membrance of me.
18 And Jesus said unto Simon, Simon behold Luke 22: 31.
Satan asketh that he may sift you, &c.

The Old Syriac and Old Latin *b* and *e* are conscious that something is missing, and decline to sanction the abrupt break of the Western text, but are not able to supply the original reading.[1]

The Documentary Evidence Explained

The textual material, with the addition of few manuscripts, is much the same as it was when W–H published their New Testament in 1881, but there has been considerable progress and some change of grounds, owing to more critical investigation of material and more extended study of theories bearing on groups of manuscripts and sources of quotations.

Among new discoveries, the most important of all, Codex W, a complete vellum uncial of the Gospels, written in the fourth or fifth century, and formerly preserved in the Library of the monastery of Schenute at Atripe (near Sohag), opposite Akhmin, in Egypt, was bought by C. L. Freer, of Detroit, early in 1906. The manuscript gives the Gospels in the usual "Western" order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark.[2]

Besides, some Gospel uncials of less note were col-

[1] No critic of note except Th. Zahn has argued for the originality of the b and e text. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 2ter, S. 363ff., Leipzig, 1907.

[2] Henry A. Saunders, *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, 1912.

lected, and some Codices were found by C. R. Gregory, on Mt. Athos, in 1886.[1]

Among versions the most important is the Sinaitic Syriac (Syr. Sin.) discovered by Mrs. Lewis and her sister, Mrs. Gibson, in the monastery of St. Catherine, on Mt. Sinai, in 1892.[2] Two copies of an Arabic translation of Tatian's *Diatessaron* were discovered, the best of which was published in 1888. The Arabic was not original, but its publication was important, for it furnished a translation of the Old Syriac, representing an early Greek text; and is believed now to have had extensive influence on the texts of the Old Syriac Versions and possibly on the Old Latin. This view is held by authorities[3] who do not go to the extent of von Soden, whose publication of the New Testament in Greek has also brought out some new material, which as yet has not been fully digested.[4]

It may be added that since the publication of W–H, through their scientific impetus, many manuscripts constituting family groups representing early uncials

---

[1] Caspar Rene Gregory, *Novum Testamentum Græce*, Prolegomena, pp. 445, 446, 1894.

[2] F. C. Burkitt, M.A., *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, p. 209, 1904.

[3] "Hermann von Soden has assigned a very important place to the *Diatessaron*. He argues that every departure from his supposed I–H–K text that is found at an earlier date than the constitution of that text, is due to the influence of the *Diatessaron*. That harmonizing, conscious or unconscious, played a great part in ancient as in modern citations, cannot be disputed. But it is impossible to prove so great an influence of the *Diatessaron*, seeing that its original form has disappeared." Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, p. 56, New York, 1917.

[4] Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Berlin, 1902–1923.

not now extant have been carefully collated,[1] early versions, such as the Old Syriac, Old Latin, and Old Egyptian published, and quotations from the early fathers collected and investigated, in the endeavor to determine the original text.

It was the conviction of Westcott and Hort, from their lifelong examination of all documents, that a reading sustained by the joint testimony of ℵ B, except under exceptional circumstances, was more authentic than that endorsed by any other group.[2] Yet in this passage they rejected the reading of these codices. It is true that since their day it has been "found that the testimony of the B ℵ type of text has been practically restricted to Egypt, with the exception of the use of it by Jerome to correct the Old Latin as found in the Vulgate."[3] Jerome did a great deal of work on the Gospels, and corrected the "text according to the B ℵ type, which he evidently regarded as the best" (see Wordsworth and White's "Epilogus," p. 657ff.).[4]

After an extended examination of the authorities here Dr. Hort concedes that "intrinsically both readings are difficult, but in an unequal degree." He asserts that "the difficulty of the shorter reading consists exclusively in the change of the order as to the

[1] Alfred Schmidtke, Die Evangelien eines Alten Unzialcodex, Leipzig, 1903. This manuscript is in the Bibliothèque Nationale (gr. 97), Paris. It has in Luke 22: 15–20 the longer text of Bℵ, and is supposed to represent the text of an Uncial of the sixth century.

[2] "Every group containing both ℵ and B is found, where Internal Evidence is tolerably unambiguous, to have an apparently more original text than every opposed group containing neither." *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introd., p. 210.

[3] A. Souter, *Mansfield College Essays*, p. 361, London, 1909.

[4] Ibid., p. 362.

Bread and Cup," involving disagreement with Paul and Matthew–Mark. But he thinks that the longer reading presents a greater difficulty in that it "divides the institution of the Cup into two parts, between which the institution of the Bread is interposed." After demurring against the opinion that the "cup of v. 17 is the first (or second) of the four cups of the paschal feast," because this involves a displacement of the command to drink or receive recorded in Luke, in connection with the cup, and of "the declaration λέγω ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ πίω κ.τ.λ. attached to the institution of the cup by Matthew and Mark divorcing them from the institution itself, and transferring them to the time of the rites preparatory to the Supper. The supposition that vv. 17, 18 contain an anticipatory reference to the institution of the Cup as recorded in v. 20, is no less improbable." "These difficulties, added to the suspicious coincidence with 1 Cor. 11:24f., and the Transcriptional evidence given above, leave no moral doubt (see *Introd.*, p. 240) that the words in question were absent from the original text of Lc, notwithstanding the purely Western ancestry of the documents which omit them."[1]

Many writers assume a negative attitude towards the Lord's Supper, and think it sufficient to quote the above as proof of the authenticity of the Western text.[2] Then the Last Supper is abbreviated into a

[1] *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Appendix, pp. 63, 64, Cambridge, 1881.

[2] It is quite the fashion for authors to buttress their critical notes on W–H. "We shall not go back of W–H text." Alfred Morris Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*, p. 39, 1920.

In the discussion of εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν A. C. McGiffert says: "Expecting as he did to return at an early day (compare Mark 14:25),

farewell meal, with a declaration of despair rather than of hope,[1] though critics of ability concede that either text-form "may be original."[2] The Western text makes no reference to the blood of Christ, and consequently eliminates the institutional and sacramental character of the Supper. But a respectable company of scholars decline to accept the text of W-H as final;[3] a proof of which is apparent in the various

---

he can hardly have been solicitous to provide for the preservation of his memory; and it is a notable fact that neither Matthew nor Mark records such a command, while the passage in which it occurs in Luke is omitted in many of the oldest manuscripts, and is regarded as an interpolation by Westcott and Hort." *Apostolic Age*, p. 69, 1897.

" 'Leave us no moral doubt,' says Hort." H. McLachlan, M.A., B.D., *St. Luke the Man and His Work*, p. 135, 1920.

"The cancellation of the words, 'given for you,' 'poured out for you,' in the institution of the Sacrament (Luke 22: 19f) is so conspicuous as to have led to the insertion in later texts of a form (19b, 20), based on 1 Cor. 11: 24f. But the spuriousness of the addition is generally recognized by textual critics." B. W. Bacon, *American Journ. of Theology*, pp. 30, 31, 1917.

But Wellhausen maintains that the interpolation is found at the beginning of v. 19, while W–H assign it only to 19b, 20. J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Lucae*, S. 121.

"The passages marked by Westcott and Hort as interpolations have been omitted from this translation, as being no part of the original text." Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The New Testament*, p. vi, Chicago, 1923.

[1] F. C. Burkitt, *The Journ. of Theological Studies*, p. 569, July, 1908.

[2] Doctor Sanday concedes that both text-forms are old and that "either may be original," but as if swayed by Hort favors the possibility of interpolation; saying, "We cannot doubt that both these types of texts existed early in the second century. Either may be original. And this is one of those cases where internal evidence is strongly in favor of the text which we call Western. The temptation to expand was much stronger than to contract; and the double mention of the cup raises real difficulties of the kind which suggest interpolation." *Hastings D. B.*, Vol. ii, p. 636, Edinburgh, 1899.

[3] "Great as has been my veneration for Hort and my admiration for the good work that he has done, I have never been able to feel that his work was final, and have disliked the servility with which his his-

theories advanced to explain the bifurcation. G. H. Gwilliam, B.D., endorsing the Received Text of Luke 22:19, 20, said: "It has the very highest diplomatic attestation, including the Old Uncials. It can be rejected only on *a priori* grounds. The case illustrates the difference between two schools of criticism—those who follow the testimony of ancient manuscripts and those who are influenced by subjective considerations."

1. *External Evidence.* But before theories are sum-

---

tory of the text has been accepted, and even his nomenclature adopted, as if now the last word had been said on the subject of New Testament criticism." G. Salmon, *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, p. 33, London, 1897.

"The full text is read with confidence after a consideration of the textual evidence which will be found in Appendix A." W. B. Frankland, M.A., *The Early Eucharist*, p. 35, London, 1902.

Professor Chase said: "Great as is the hesitation which any one must feel in traversing an opinion of Doctor Hort, I am constrained to express my doubt as to the soundness of his position in regard to what he terms 'Western Non-Interpolation,' Matt. 27:49; Luke 22:19; 24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52. . . ." H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament*, Vol. i, p. 386, 1910.

"We confidently accept the fuller narrative of Luke, as it is given in all the most important manuscripts, in the overwhelming majority of authorities, and in the Received Text." Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., *The Expository Times*, p. 345, May, 1910.

Jülicher said: "Doch halte Ich die beiden verse aus ausseren und inneren Gründen für echt lucanisch, und ihre Streichung für einen methodischen Fehler." *Theologische Abhandlungen*, S. 235.

"But in spite of the deservedly high authority of Westcott and Hort in a matter such as this, recent criticism tends more and more to decide against them in this particular case, and to adhere to the reading of the *Textus Receptus*." John C. Lambert, B.D., *The Sacraments of the New Testament*, p. 245, 1903.

"The consensus of all the great Greek codices supports the longer reading, which must be accepted by every sound principle of textual criticism." J. T. Levens, M.A., *Aspects of the Holy Communion*, p. 352, London, 1911.

"We may now say that the shorter reading in Luke's Gospel is

marized it is proper to give a brief account of the documentary witnesses. This introduction is intended to aid only the ordinary student to an elementary account of some of the more important manuscripts and their readings.

(a) *The Western Text.* The Græco-Latin uncial Codex D, called also *Codex Bezae*, is the principal support of the "Western text." It is the oldest Greek-Latin manuscript[1] of the Bible, and contains the Gospel of Matthew, Luke, Mark, and Acts in that order. While paleographers agree that the manuscript itself is not older than the beginning of the sixth (or fifth, Prof. Burkitt and Dr. Loew) century, the text is supposed to belong to the second century.[2]

---

probably not the original one but that it has arisen through some erroneous curtailment of the longer. And this at the same time puts out of court all the attempts that have been made, from Gardner (*The Lord's Supper*, 1893; in a different form in *Exploratio Evangelica*, 454f., 1899) to Butler (*Nineteenth Century*, 1905, lxiii, 492ff.; compare, on the other hand, Cheetham, *The Mysteries Pagan and Christian*, 1877, 110ff.) to derive the breaking of bread (in the literal sense of the term) from the Eleusinian Mysteries." Carl Clemen, Ph.D., D.D., *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, p. 242, Edinburgh, 1912.

Rev. G. Margoliouth, M.A., in an article on "*The Institution of the Eucharist* writes, "The main purpose of this paper is to defend the genuineness of Luke 22: 19b, 20 against the prevalent opinion to the contrary." Then in alluding to the second cup which proved a stumbling block to Doctor Sanday he said: "But what if the two cups should actually prove, not a difficulty in the received text of St. Luke, but a great support in its favor? And what if not only W–H, but also other great textual critics, have been led to reject verses 19b, 20 simply because they had not the opportunity of reading St.Luke in the light of the Jewish family observance of the Passover night?" *The Expository Times*, pp. 412, 414, June, 1924.

[1] E. Nestle, *Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*, p. 64, London, 1901.

[2] F. H. Scrivener, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*, Introd., p. lxiv, Cambridge, 1864.

As remarked by Prof. Blass, "it may be justly termed the greatest treasure which the University of Cambridge possesses,"[1] to which it was presented by the reformer, Theodore de Beze, or Beza, in 1581. Beza got it mutilated as it now is in 1562, and it came, to all appearance, from the monastery of St. Irenæus, Lyons.[2] Its previous history is uncertain, but it is thought by many that it always belonged to southern France,[3] where a text similar to D is believed to have existed from an early age.

This manuscript received no critical attention of any consequence until the present age, and was viewed erratic and unsafe until lately. All critics up to the last decade of the nineteenth century disparaged D as a freak among manuscripts.[4] Tischendorf attached but little weight to it, and W–H treated it with contempt. But the conviction has obtained in the last fifty years that Codex Bezae possesses more critical

[1] F. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 96, London, 1898.

[2] "All outward appearances point to Gaul as the native country of Codex Bezae, nor is there any valid reason for thinking that it ever left that country till it was carried into Italy in 1546." F. H. A. Scrivener, *op. cit.*, p. xxxi.

"On the whole the Rhone valley is the most probable place." K. Lake, D.D., *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 17, London, 1908.

"Doctor Loew has recently impugned this view. He points out cases where the scribe began to write Greek instead of Latin, and draws the inference that Greek was his mother-tongue. He also shows that the symbols used for omissions and transpositions are Greek, and that all the early annotations are in Greek. The provenance of the manuscript must, therefore, be regarded as doubtful." Albert C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, p. 50, Oxford, 1914.

[3] Griesbach, who, in preparing his Greek Testament, 1745–1812, assigned the name "Western text" to the group represented by D, attached no importance to it.

[4] Matthei asked: "Quis enim sanae mentis homo Codicam Bezæ sequatur?"

value than admitted by W–H, but its actual place is not settled. It is thought by some that the variants in this passage may have descended from an uncritical age, before transcribers acquired their punctilious accuracy in handling sacred documents. One class of scholars attempt to account for the origin of D on the assumption that all other manuscripts have descended from revisions, but that D represents a "pre-canonical text-form."[1] Others, after offsetting learned arguments, think it more probable that "extra-canonical Gospels, Gospel harmonies, translations, and much-used commentaries" have influenced the text of D.[2]

But as the best representative of the "Western text" its evidence when substantiated by the Old Syriac and Old Latin is very important. Hort states that "the text used by all those Ante-Nicene Greek writers, not being connected with Alexandria, who have left considerable remains is substantially Western."[3] "There is now no trace visible of any type of text but a "Western" down to and including the early part of the third century."[4] The Old Syriac and Old Latin Versions both date from the second century, and represent Greek manuscripts which prevailed, according to the one in the East, and according to the other in the West; and having been put out

[1] A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien*, 1 Heft, S. 30ff., 1893.

[2] W. Berning, *Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie*, S. 32, 1901.

[3] *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Vol. ii, p. 113, London, 1881. But it shows tendency to explain by paraphrase, or amplification, and though it does not polish and remove vulgarisms like some manuscripts, and though some of its readings may be very old they need not for that be original. A. Jülicher, *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 606, 1904.

[4] A. Souter, M.A., *Mansfield College Essays*, p. 361, London, 1909.

of circulation by the Peshitta and Vulgate, they have preserved unchanged readings current at that time. But there is considerable difference of opinion among scholars about the origin and history of the Syriac Versions, consequently the weight of their evidence must still be determined by the textual expert.

Manuscripts are classified in groups. The Old Latin Versions belong to the D group. The Old Latin *k* (Codex Bobiensis, vi cent.), the best representative of the African group, is defective in our passage. But *a* (Codex Vercellensis, iv cent.), which is a kind of connecting link between the African and European Versions, sustains D; as does also *ff* (Codex Corbeiensis, vii cent.), which preserves a text of high excellency. As compared with other Old Latin versions this text is least emended. It is believed that its scribe in no instance consciously deviated from his exemplar.[1] These are followed by *i* (Codex Vindobonensis, vii cent.), of the European group, and *l* (Codex Rehdigernaus, vii cent.), whose text is to a large extent pure Vulgate.

The Old Latin *b* and *e*, both iv cent., have a text less pure than *a* and *ff*, for the scribe of the former shows harmonizing tendency, and that of the latter exhibit fabrications which show inaccuracies on every page. Both transpose v. 17 after v. 19a, implying that the text was not in their exemplar.

The Old Latin like Codex Bezae omit all words after Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, and all except *b* and *e* have the bread after the cup, thus reversing the order of Matthew, Mark, and Paul. This reversed order is

[1] E. S. Buchanan, *The Journ. of Theological Studies*, p. 249, January, 1906.

also found in the *Didache* (chap. 9), "For the Eucharist, give thanks thus, first, for the cup." However, it is probable that this order was meant for the Agape[1] which preceded the Lord's Supper.[2] The *Didache* takes back to the first half of the second century, but according to modern views "the work describes not the condition of the church at large," and it is doubtful that it reflects anything more than the practice of a "remote and backward district." There is no other liturgical, or patristic testimony[3] for this order, for the casual placing of the cup before the bread in 1 Cor. 10:16, 21 is more than balanced by Paul's formal statement in 1 Cor. 11:25. It is possible that the order of bread first and afterwards the cup is unduly emphasized by our modern form. For in a meal, such as the primitive Supper (and the Agape), the line of demarkation is lost, since the bread and the cup are partaken of interchangeably and indiscriminately.

Since the Old Latin Versions in this passage are not confirmed by any codex save D, it is possible that

[1] "The balance of probability seems therefore to be with the view that we have here the Agape." Arthur John MacLean, D.D., *The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 25, 1922.

"Perhaps we shall not err if we see in the first and second of the three the blessing of the *agape* or common meal, and place the actual commemoration of the Lord's death after the third." H. B. Swete, D.D., *Services and Service-Books*, p. 79, London, 1914.

[2] "The Didache (x, 3, compare 1 Cor. 10:3f.) knows the order, "meat and drink" and "the prayers (lx, 2f.), but the first for the cup, then over the bread, do not belong to the eucharist in the stricter sense, but to the introductory Agape." T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, ii, S. 364, 1907.

[3] On the strength of these Scriptures Spitta regards Paul as a witness for an older variant, in which the cup precedes the bread. Rudolf Schaefer, *Das Herren mahl nach Ursprung und Bedeutung*, S. 23, 1897.

they are only giving us what they first received from D; therefore all depends upon the trustworthiness of this uncial, which often is disappointing.

The vital point in our inquiry is a comparison of the ℵ B and D texts in the last three chapters of Luke's Gospel, and an interpretation of the variant documents in a way that will retrace the original. The testimony of D in Luke 22–24 is anything but convincing. Beginning with our passage and comparing the text with W–H to the end of Luke, we find D so badly edited, or eccentric, as to cause alarming distrust. For out of sixteen omissions W–H discredited six of them, and out of seventeen additions they refused fifteen, and out of twenty-six transpositions and other minor inaccuracies they rejected all and preferred the readings of other manuscripts.[1] Therefore, consistency requires that the testimony of D should either receive more general respect, or be rejected here also, since it virtually stands alone.

But, though the external evidence for the shorter text is scant, it is aided somewhat by internal evidence, for it avoids the awkward grammatical difficulty of τὸ ποτήριον . . . ἐν τῷ αἵματι, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον where ἐκχυννόμενον agrees in sense with αἵματι but grammatically with ποτήριον.[2] Yet if the early churches were uniform in their communion order, it is more inconceivable that the fellow traveler who

[1] Fr. Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, pp. 8ff.

[2] ἐκχυννόμενον no doubt refers to αἵματι, as it does in the same statement given by Matthew and Mark, and not to the cup, or its contents. That Basil so understood it, is certain, for he said, διαθήκη ἐστὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. (This cup is the Testament in my blood, which (blood) is shed for you.) *Moral. Reg.*, xxi, c., iii, Tom. ii, p. 432.

knew Paul's communion formula by memory, the historian who had visited the Jerusalem church, and "traced the course of all things accurately from the first," and knew with "certainty" all matters of Christian cultus (1:3, 4), should invalidate his own report by a flat contradiction and annulment of the eucharistic declarations on record.

The "Western text" has become the center of new importance since W–H, yet this was fully recognized by Dr. C. R. Gregory, but he himself saw no justification for assigning to D any superiority over ℵ and B.[1] Though Codex D preserves some original readings, Harnack (in confuting Dr. Blass' theory of two editions of Luke), expressed the belief that the majority of the additions and changes are the work of a redactor who consciously adapted his style to the original.[2]

The "Western" testimony for D is not unanimous, for *c*, *f*, *q* and the Vulgate support the longer text; and *c*, though a late manuscript, has an old text which gives many readings with D. The Ferrar Group also, which seems to represent a lost uncial, have many Western readings, but part company with Codex D in this passage. Still more significant, the Freer Codex W, which exhibit the Western order Matthew, John, Luke, Mark; and though following a Western text in Luke, still contains verses 19b, 20 complete, thus witnessing for the longer text.

When we follow those who hypothetically urge the adoption of the shorter text, it is well to remember that the argument is more *e silentio* than from con-

[1] *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes*, Erster Band, S. 47ff.; Leipzig, 1900.

[2] A. Harnack, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, July 6, 1907.

firmatory testimony, for that Codex D here contains Luke's autograph, or the whole eucharistic tradition is very improbable.[1]

(b) *The Textus Receptus Text Form.* Textual support is overwhelmingly on the side of the longer text. But, though evidence is based on groups and not on multiplicity of manuscripts, the testimony is not adequately expressed by saying that this includes all uncials save one, all cursives, and many versions, unless we are reminded that this includes not only the oldest manuscripts, but groups of cursives which represent early uncials no longer extant.

The longer text is preserved in the two oldest manuscripts, the Vatican B and the Sinaiticus ℵ,[2] both of the fourth century. The latter has the Ammonian sections and Eusebian Canons,[3] though not in the

[1] Even Doctor Blass, who held that Luke had written a first and a second edition of the Gospel and Acts, did not believe that we have now either of the original texts. R. A. Hoffmann, *Die Abendmahlgedanken Jesu Christi*, S. 19, 1896.

"If as is probable Luke was abbreviated to D through some unknown accident in some remote period of the second century, then *b* and *e* show the text supplemented by transposition, and the Syriac borrowed from Paul the words concerning the bread, and transposed the words of verse 17 to fill the place of the missing cup." Fr. Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, S. 6, Goettingen, 1895.

The omission of 19b, 20 as an accident of the Latin text, is supposed in the Greek of D due to assimilation to the Latin. Pierre Batiffol, *Etudes D'Histoire et de Theologie Positive*, Deuxieme Serie, p. 27, 1905.

[2] The testimony of ℵ BC, is also sustained by other manuscripts such as L, "the foundation of whose text is non-Western and pre-Syrian," which is rich in "early readings neither Western nor Alexandrian." F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in Greek*, Introd., p. 153, London, 1881.

[3] The *Eusebian Canons* consisted in an ingenious scheme for comparing the contents of the Gospels, which were divided into sections and parallel passages with marginal references.

hand of the first scribe, yet of early time, indicating through these symbols that the manuscript was prepared for learned use and was critically examined before leaving the scriptorium.

The longer text attested by such multiplicity of manuscripts would be accepted unquestionably were it not for its similarity to Paul's tradition, yet since agreement (with Paul) is expected, it is unnatural to abandon this much confirmed reading and declare that only one (D) rather late and unusual uncial has preserved the oldest reading.

It has been assumed that the Antiochian text is the result of recension under Lucian, and it is now asserted that there were still earlier recensions, such as at Alexandria under Hesychius,[1] and perhaps at Cæsarea under Pamphilius. While the contingencies of revisions remove us from the original, it is hardly legitimate to discard the reading of apparently the most trustworthy codices merely on hypothetical grounds. We do not know what Greek texts Hesychius, Lucian, and Jerome possessed, nor what data prevented them from following the Old Latin Versions in this passage. Even if textual criticism was largely an unknown science to the scribes of the second century, their critical apparatus doubtless was much richer in early manuscripts and perishable papyri than that of our time.

No matter which reading is followed we are forced to hypothetical conclusions. The Old Syriac now are regarded the earliest of all versions. They are closely connected with the "Western text," but in this pas-

[1] P. M. Barnard, Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, ii, p. 722b, 1906. K. Lake, *Professor H. von Soden's Treatment of the Text of the Gospels*, p. 25, 1908.

sage they represent independent mixture of the true text,[1] and show dissatisfaction with D, as if cognizant of a discrepancy. They betray much confusion, and give evidence of repeated corrections, for γέννημα (fruit, v. 18), is rendered by three different Syriac words respectively, by each of three Syriac Versions.[2] But both Eastern and Western texts give vv. 15–18 in their regular order, and thus witness against the Old Syriac Versions which transpose here.

It is supposed by Burkitt and von Soden that the Old Syriac Versions were influenced by Tatian's *Diatessaron* (a Harmony of the Gospels). But in supplementing D, they sustain their corrections without transcribing from ℵ B; for Syr. Cur. has "This is my body which (is) for you," without διδόμενον; and Syr. Sin. has "This is my body which I give for you, Thus do in remembrance of me." In omitting "which is poured out for you" (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον), which is not found in Paul, it appears that the Syriac was not influenced by the Matthew–Mark tradition.

If the *Diatessaron* was prepared in Rome, where Tatian sojourned before he returned to Mesopotamia, it is possible that it only represents the same exemplar as the Old Latin Versions, which existed in Rome in the second century.[3] Then the partial agreement of

[1] F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, ii, p. 223, Cambridge, 1904.

[2] Theodor Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Zweiter Band, S. 363, Leipzig, 1907.

[3] "The text of the Gospels underlying the Syriac *Diatessaron*, where it can be recovered in its original form, represents the Greek text as read in Rome about 170 A. D. The text of the Gospels in the Old Syriac Version represents, where it differs from the *Diatessaron*, the Greek text as read in Antioch about 200 A. D." F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 78, New York, 1904.

the Old Syriac with the Western text here is not the testimony of an additional group against ℵ BCL, but what we have is "Group against group, not two very early groups against one."[1]

Westcott and Hort could not avail themselves of the *Diatessaron* and Sinaitic Syriac, which were discovered after their day; but Prof. Burkitt, to whom we are indebted for perhaps the best elucidation of the Old Syriac Versions, in his Note on Luke 22: 17–20, says: "In agreement with Westcott and Hort I assume that the true text of these verses is that preserved by Codex Bezae. The reasons for this view are set forth in Dr. Hort's well-known Note on the passage (Appendix, p. 63) and do not need repetition here."[2] But we may remark that it is doubtful that the Old Syriac supports this as a "Western Non-Interpolation," which was the theory of W–H; for Dr. Burkitt selected twenty-seven variants omitted by Codex D which W–H designated "Western Non-Interpolations" and showed that according to the Old Syriac half of them are not interpolations at all,[3]

---

[1] The third century fragment of Matthew discovered and edited by Grenfell & Hunt (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, pt. i, pp. 4–7), older, probably by a century, than any known manuscript of any part of the New Testament, sides most decidedly with ℵ and B. In Matt. 1: 16 and 18, it rejects the readings of Codex Bezae and its allies. F. C. Burkitt, Introduction to *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria*, p. x, 1899.

"At the outset it seems to be a fact that the Latin did not influence the Syriac, but the Syriac the Latin. There is a priority of action of Syriac on Latin as against Latin on Syriac." H. C. Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, p. xiii, London, 1914.

[2] F. C. Burkitt, M.A., *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, Vol. ii, p. 300, Cambridge, 1904.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

and some worthy critics decline to accept the verdict of W–H as final here.

Though versions and cursives are called secondary authorities, in the examination of this passage some are of equal importance with the uncials, since they preserve old texts no longer extant; such for instance as the Group 1– 118– 131 209;[1] the Ferrar Group 13– 60– 124– 346; Hoskier 604;[2] Schmidtke Codex Olympias;[3] and 565. Since these in many variants agree with the Old Syriac and Old Latin against ℵB, their support as independent witnesses of the longer text in this passage is more significant. To these also must be added the significant testimony of the Freer manuscript (Codex W). Furthermore, 19b, 20 received some very early endorsement of Church fathers and early Christian liturgy. They are confirmed by the most authentic texts of both Justin and Tertullian. Justin has repeatedly referred to the Eucharist and uniformly placed the loaf before the cup:

"For the Apostles, in the records (ἀπομνημονεύματα) made by them called 'Gospels,' delivered that it was enjoined upon them thus, that Jesus took a loaf and gave thanks and said: 'This do for my memorial; (Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου), this is my body;' and took the cup similarly and gave thanks and said: 'This is my blood.'" *Apolog.* i. 66.

Justin corroborates this order still further:

"Now it is clear that in this prophecy also reference is made to the bread, which our Christ delivered to us to offer for a memorial of his having become incarnate for the sake of those who believe upon him,

[1] K. Lake, M.A., *Text and Studies*, Vol. vii, No. 3, Cambridge, 1902.

[2] H. C. Hoskier, *A Full Account And Collection of Codex Evangelium*, 604, London, 1890.

[3] This manuscript (gr. 97 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris,) was prepared at the request of a certain Abbess Olympias in the thirteenth century, from an Uncial of the fifth century.

for whose sakes He also became subject to suffering; and to the cup, which he delivered to us to offer in the Eucharist, for a memorial of his blood." *Trypho*, 70.

Thus Justin uniformly sustains the order of the *Textus Receptus*. Being a native of Samaria and a traveler, he reflects the communion practice of Jerusalem, Asia Minor, and Rome during the first half of the second century. He quotes from the "Gospels," and gives τοῦτο ποιεῖτε κ.τ.λ., showing that Paul's account is primitive, and that all the Synoptical reports of the Lord's Supper are abbreviated. This tends to show that Codex D is secondary, and that Luke and Paul supply the oldest traditions without any liturgical modifications.[1]

Tertullian, in confuting Marcion, who he declared had emended and mutilated the Third Gospel, quotes Luke 22:15, 19a, 20. He said, "He likewise when mentioning the cup and making the new testament to be sealed in his blood affirms the reality of his body."[2]

Thus it appears that Marcion's Gospel of Luke, though mutilated, still contained our passage, for the cup here is connected with the covenant, and is symbolic of our Lord's blood. Even if Tertullian used an Old Latin Version his copy apparently had the order of our longer text, for he places the cup after the bread:

"In like manner, when treating of the Gospel we have proved from

[1] Justin did not give in the Apology the words, "This do in remembrance of me," after the cup, but in quoting them in the Dialogue with Trypho, he "shows positively that the source from which he drew, as the authority of the Apostles, was more copious than his recitation in the Apology." A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu Lukas*, S. 634, Leipzig, 1895.

[2] *Tertullian adv. Marcion*, iv, 40.

the sacrament of the bread and the cup the verity of the Lord's body and blood in opposition to Marcion's phantom."[1]

2. *Internal Evidence.* The words should not be interpreted by textual criticism alone, but also by careful inquiry of their relation to the archæological form of the Passover celebration.[2]

If we follow the shorter text we not only reverse the order of the other eucharistic records in placing the cup before the bread, but dispute Paul's statement that the eucharistic cup was after (μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι) the Paschal Supper. If any of the New Testament writers knew positively the order of the Jewish passover, we would expect him to be Paul, but the same could say of the Communion Order, "I have received of the Lord" (ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου), therefore, Paul's text-form is favored as being presumably creditable. But adherence to Paul's order makes Luke present two cups; and the words that accompany the cups indicate that our Lord received (δεξάμενος) the first, as from a passover attendant, but took (λαβὼν in like manner as he had taken the loaf) the second from the table, as the author of a new order. Which of the two cups is the one endorsed by Paul? Luke uses the same verb (λαβὼν), in connection with the bread as Paul employed (ἔλαβεν), which is also approved by Mark and Matthew, and even by Codex D. In like manner the cup of the sacrament demands the same verb (λαβὼν) as given by all, except D, there-

[1] *Ibid.*, v. 8.

[2] For a fuller discussion of Luke 22: 15–20 with archæological references, see A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu Lukas*, S. 620f., Leipzig, 1895. W. Berning, *Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie*, Munster i. W., 1901. A. Merx, *Die Vier Kanonischen Evangelien*, ii, S. 416f., Berlin, 1905.

fore, with the endorsement of Paul, the internal evidence thus far supports Luke's second cup. But Luke's first cup was antecedent to the cup of the Christian institution, which according to Paul's order was "after supper." The parallel of Luke institutes a comparison between the supper of the old covenant, with its eating (v. 16) and drinking (v. 18), and the meal of the new covenant, with its loaf (v. 19) and cup (v. 20). Thus, to omit Luke's second cup is to destroy the parallelism.

But as Paul's tradition lacks Luke's first cup we examine what Luke said of it: He received (δεξάμενος) a cup, and when he had given thanks he said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come."

A part of these words are displaced and given after the second cup by Matthew and Mark: "Verily, I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25).

These words of Matthew and Mark come after the Lord's Supper as given by Paul, but precede it in Luke's longer text, therefore all Synoptists agree that these words are no part of the Lord's Supper. But if these words do not belong to the sacrament proper, then the first cup is introductory. This is still more apparent since the first cup has no connection with the blood of Jesus and the new covenant.[1] Then the shorter text leaves us v. 19a only, or communion in

[1] Resch has shown that καινὴ and διαθήκη are key-words of the Lord's Supper, and their omission in the shorter text casts doubt on Codex D.

one species only, if indeed we have a communion at all. While Westcott and Hort attempt to explain the change of order as to the Bread and Cup[1] of the shorter reading, they entirely overlook that the cup of the shorter reading is not sacramental. Schmiedel for this very reason rejects the shorter text, for he regards it an impossibility "that the Evangelist himself should have furnished us with an account of the Lord's Supper that contains no words of Jesus indicative of the significance of the elements except, 'This is my body,' without any explanation of the cup."[2] But communion in one species only, or with the cup omitted after the bread, is not only contrary to the practice of the church from the first century (1 Cor. 11:25), but inconsistent with our Lord's own order: "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed," John 6:55. There is no history that inversion of the order of consecration ever was practised anywhere or at any time.

If we regard Luke's account, which alone connects definitely the Lord's Supper with the passover celebration, the most original of the Synoptics, it follows that Mark and Matthew by transposing v. 18 of Luke after the Supper have added an idea of futurity to it by their "that day" (τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης), not supported

---

[1] "The difficulty of the shorter reading consists exclusively in the change of order as to the Bread and the Cup, which is illustrated by many phenomena of the relation between the narratives of the third and of the first two Gospels, and which finds an exact parallel in the change of order in St. Luke's account of the Temptation (4:5–8; 9–12), corrected in like manner in accordance with Matthew in some Old Latin manuscripts and in Amb." *The New Testament in Greek*, Appendix, p. 64.

[2] *The Princeton Theological Review*, p. 636, October, 1910.

by Luke. To Jesus and the disciples the coming of the kingdom, which was an object of daily prayer (Matt. 6:10), and which was said to be already amongst them (Matt. 18:2), was near enough to give the passover its fulfillment in the Upper Room.[1] Then the loaf and cup of vv. 19, 20 of the New Testament kingdom of God take the place of the Old Testament passover, and vv. 16–18, instead of being redundant, gain a new meaning. Ever since, in the true communion of saints, the cup holds its place as the cup of the kingdom.

We seem then to have in Luke 22:16–18 a remnant of the original text, but it is possible that on account of the prevailing eschatological idea of a postponed fulfillment of the coming of the kingdom, the words, "I shall not drink from henceforth" (v. 18) caused a copyist to strike out the second cup. In like manner may be explained the shortening of v. 19, for as half of the verse is missing in Matthew and Mark, this may have influenced a transcriber to abbreviate Luke's text also. On the whole then, it is easier to believe that 19b, 20 were omitted than that they were added by interpolation; for if such interpolation were copied once, would we not expect it to be corrected by uninterpolated copies rather than become universal? If

[1] What is said of the passover, verse 16, "I will not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God," is logically said of verse 17, for what was "fulfilled" evidently was the passover, and not the Lord's Supper, which as yet had no existence. Therefore, the "cup" of verse 17 cannot be identified with the eucharistic cup.

The triumphal entry into Jerusalem had already taken place (Luke 19:36–48), and Jesus as the Messiah entered into the temple and cast out all them that bought and sold and overthrew the tables of the money changers, not simply to rehabilitate the temple sanctity, but in order to bring in the *Kingdom*.

the longer text is an interpolation, is it reasonable to think that every trace of the primitive church order of communion could disappear?

Furthermore, according to the longer text the memorial words τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν are authentic. Their origin on any other hypothesis remains an enigma, for had Paul invented them he most assuredly would have been exposed as an impostor. There is no textual variation casting a shadow of doubt on the words of institution as given by Paul; and from the close association of Paul and Luke would we not expect such a verified tradition to appear as a part of the Third Gospel? The words, "This do in remembrance of me," have been too universally attributed to our Lord to dispute, or question their original coinage;[1] therefore, the internal evidence favors the idea that the Western text, or Codex D, furnishes only an abbreviated account of the Lord's Supper.

After this brief survey of the difficulties of the problem this chapter would not be complete without a summary of the principal theories which have been advanced to account for the discrepancy. To seek motives or intentions to account for the variants is

---

[1] Justin as we have seen quotes them as from the Gospels, *Apolog.* i, 66. They are also quoted by Origen, Jerem. Hom. xii, 2, Opp. iii, 194. See Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 651. "Thus shall ye do for my memorial, as oft as ye assemble." *Aphraates*, Hom. xii, 4, p. 188.

"Accipite bibite ex eo omnes, quia novum testamentum est in sanguine meo. Sicut vidistis me facientem, sic facietis in meam memoriam." Ephraem Syr. Serm. iv, in hebd. Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 653.

Const. v, 19, p. 151, 18.

Const. viii, 12, p. 255, 29.

Liturgy of St. Clement, p. 101; Liturgy of St. James, Fab. III, 122.

Liturgy of St. Peter, Fabricius III, 159f.

Epiphanius Haer. LXIX, 77, p. 802D.

futile, notwithstanding the laborious learning and ingenuity of writers. We shall see that we shall come nearer the truth by viewing the discrepancy as an accidental error of transcription, through homœoteleuton.

Proposed Theories Explaining the Variants

(1) It has been suggested that the original text of the Lord's Supper in the Third Gospel has disappeared. Holtzheuer[1] suggested that our shorter text originated in a gap occurring through accidental mutilation of the archetype of Codex D. Erich Haupt likewise assumed that the original wording of the institution cannot be found.[2] This hypothesis is so improbable as to find no scholarly acceptance. Berning says, "No one will seriously agree with the view of Holtzheuer."[3]

(2) It has been thought that a failure to recognize the double parallel of Luke, and the prediction over the first cup, caused a copyist to strike out the second cup, and all pertaining to the memorial meal of the new covenant.[4] Both Schmiedel (*Prot. Kztg.*, 1896, Sp. 105) and Hehn (*Die Einsetzung des hl. Abendmahls*, Wurzburg, 1900, p. 21) have been quick to remark that "if Luke mistook the first cup of his source for the Lord's Supper cup, his source must have been one in which two cups were mentioned, first a paschal, then a Lord's

---

[1] O. Holtzheuer, *Das Abendmahl u. die neuere Kritik.*, S. 27, 1896.

[2] Erich Haupt, *Ueber die Ursprüngliche Form und Bedeutung der Abendmahls Worte*, 1894.

[3] W. Berning, *Die Einsetzung der hl. Eucharistie*, Munster i. W., 1901, S. 42.

[4] Fr. Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im neuen Testament*, Goettingen, 1895.

Supper cup, that is to say, a source like our present longer Lucan text."[1]

(3) It has been thought that we have in the varied accounts three lines of traditions: (a) that of Mark; (b) that of Paul; (c) and that of Luke's shorter text, reflecting respectively the church usage of the time in three different communities.[2]

Prof. J. V. Bartlet, M.A., attempts to explain the variation of texts on the ground that Jesus followed the well-known form of Thanksgiving used in Syria in his time (Mark 6:41; Matt. 14:19), referred to also by Paul (1 Cor. 10:16). He also thinks it possible that one text-form appeared in Greece, while the other prevailed in Palestine.[3] We have already shown the improbability and groundlessness of this supposition.

(4) It has been maintained that Codex D is the product of Hebrew-Christian editorship. Alfred Resch thinks that the bifurcation here in the early text of the New Testament is due to independent translations from a Semitic Gospel, probably Hebrew; and that the cancellation of all reference to the atoning death of Jesus in the eucharistic tradition of Codex D and the *Didache* was due to Jewish-Christian influence.[4]

It has been thought that the non-Marcan source of Luke was an Aramaic document,[5] and Johannes Weiss

---

[1] H. McA. Robinson, *The Princeton Theological Review*, p. 637, October, 1910.

[2] J. Armitage Robinson, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. ii, 1418–19.

[3] *Mansfield College Essays*, p. 54, London, 1909.

[4] A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1893–95.

[5] A. M. Perry, *The Source of Luke's Passion Narrative*, p. 106, Chicago, 1920.

suggested that the shorter text is the result of religio-dogmatic tendency. But it is doubtful if there ever was a Hebrew or Aramaic Gospel of Luke.[1] It is probable that the passover ritual, and consequently the words of institution, were Aramaic.[2] But it is generally believed that the Palestinians of Jesus' time were perfectly familiar with Greek.[3]

(5) Prof. F. Blass, of Halle, suggested that Luke wrote the Gospel and Acts twice.[4] The first copy of the Gospel was prepared for Theophilus at Cæsarea; and later, on reaching Rome, the second edition of the Gospel was written for the Roman Christians, which he shortened here and lengthened there according to his pleasure.

That Luke might have written his Gospel twice had been already suggested by Johannes Clericus,[5] Bornemann,[6] Lightfoot,[7] and Zahn.[8] Westcott and Hort also stated that "the purely documentary phenomena are compatible with the supposition that the Western and Non-Western texts started respectively from a first and second edition of the Gospels, both conceivably apostolic."[9] But wholly independent of others, Dr. Blass attempted to establish his theory

---

[1] H. J. Cadbury, *The American Journal of Theology*, p. 454, July, 1920.

[2] W. Berning, *Die Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie*, S. 31, 1901.

[3] J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, pp. 8, 233, 1906.

[4] F. Blass, Zweifache Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte, *Theo. Stud. u. Kritik.*

[5] F. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 98, London, 1898.

[6] J. M. Wilson, D.D., *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 25, London, 1923.

[7] J. B. Lightfoot, *Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, p. 43, 1873.

[8] T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Band ii, 348.

[9] *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Vol. ii, p. 177, London, 1881.

from the perusal of the style and material. He thought that the archetype of D left out the whole of Luke 22:19, 20, thus giving a narrative "clear and consistent in itself, but not containing any longer the institution of the Lord's Supper; for the order of celebration was well known to the Romans, and therefore not necessary."[1] In referring the variants to Luke himself, the theory ignores the stratified influence of revision, and holds no weight now save historical interest.[2]

(6) It has been suggested by Bousset (and others) that the "whole text-form was accidental, that is, without tendency, but developed little by little; the first traces of which are found with Tatian, and received its greatest development in Codex Bezae."[3]

(7) Westcott and Hort's Theory of "Western Non-Interpolation." In their preparation of their Greek New Testament, Codex D held minor place in their confidence.

However, in accordance with their rule that a copyist is more likely to add to than to omit a part of the text, they followed Codex D in some of its omissions, even when at variance with all other uncials, and called the rejected longer readings "Western Non-Interpolations," as having been interpolated into all non-Western texts. In accordance with this prin-

---

[1] F. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 179, London, 1898.

[2] It has been recently repeated that, "St. Luke wrote a first draft of the Acts, and then revised, rewrote, and somewhat shortened it in the copy which he sent to Theophilus at Antioch, . . . thus from the earliest period two texts of the Acts came to exist, a longer and a shorter, a Western and an Antiochian." J. M. Wilson, D.D., *The Acts of the Apostles, translated from Codex Bezae*, 1923.

[3] W. Berning, *Die Einsetzung der heiligen Eucharistie*, S. 39, 1901.

ciple they bracketed Luke 22: 19b, 20; and swayed by their great authority, many New Testament scholars continue to reject these verses as interpolation from 1 Cor. 11: 24, 25 and Mark 14: 24.

It appears somewhat inconsistent to view the Western text in the main as too erratic to be trusted, yet in a few instances to depend on it exclusively. Examination of the last three chapters of St. Luke in Codex D reveals so many omissions and irregularities in its archetype as to impair confidence in the authenticity of the shorter text. Therefore, the brackets must be regarded unfortunate, for they not only cast doubt on what they enclose, but lend support to the implication that the shorter reading of Codex D has preserved the whole original text.

While sensible of the great authority of Westcott and Hort, our impulse here is to doubt their verdict, and follow Tischendorf and the Revised Version, for no reading in all their edition is based on more slender conjecture, and none invites more violence to historical Christianity.[1]

(8) Omission and transposition due to *Homœoteleuton*.[2] Griesbach laid down as a canon of criticism that of two variants, the shorter reading is to be preferred, as a copyist was more likely to add to the text than to omit. W–H fully endorsed this principle (*brevior*

[1] Writers of the Lord's Supper find that the brackets of W–H leave an unsatisfactory text; see J. H. Srawley, D.D., Hastings, *Encyclop. of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. v, p. 640b, 1912.

[2] *Homœoteleuton* strictly means similarity of termination. When a similar ending or a similar word, occurs twice in the same paragraph, a copyist easily passed from the first passage to the second, omitting the intermediate words. Doctor Clark gives innumerable illustrations of omissions due to *homœoteleuton*.

lectio potior), and may have been influenced by it in this case. But the falsity of this rule is successfully controverted in numerous instances by Prof. Albert C. Clark,[1] who advanced as a thesis "that it is the longer text which is original, and that the shorter text has been derived from it."[2] He gives a very intelligent explanation of the discrepancy in Luke 22: 15–20, and upholds the longer reading of the *Textus Receptus*.

As a classical scholar working on the text of Cicero, he made examinations of the variants, and by counting the number of letters omitted discovered the unit for the lines of the archetype, and the multiple of lines omitted. He then applied this principle in the study of the oldest uncials of the New Testament. In support of his method of investigation he cites that Rev. H. S. Cronin (*Journ. of Theolog. Studies*, xiii, pp. 563–571, 1911–12), working independently had arrived at similar conclusions, viz., that Codex "ℵ is derived from a manuscript which contained on an average eleven letters to the line."[3] He himself found also that B is "derived from an ancestor containing 10–12 letters to the line."

And as to the practice of giving the preference to the shorter readings, he asserts: "Nowhere is the falsity of the maxim *brevior lectio potior* more evident than in the New Testament. The process has been one of contraction, not of expansion. The primitive text is the longest, not the shortest."[4]

That *homœoteleuton* might be the frequent cause of

---

[1] *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford, 1914.
[2] *Journ. of Theological Studies*, p. 226, Vol. xvi, 1915.
[3] *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, pp. 32, 33, Oxford, 1914.
[4] *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, p. vi, Oxford, 1914.

discrepancies was known before, but that investigation of variants should reveal that the preference formerly given to shorter texts was erroneous was hardly to be expected, therefore it was not strange that this method and conclusions were soon disputed by Dr. Sanday,[1] Dr. Souter,[2] and Sir Frederic Kenyon.[3] But their criticisms, which drew from Professor Clark a credible rejoinder,[4] did not invalidate his conclusions with regard to the original text-form of our passage.

It is worthy of note that as a result of his study of Gospel manuscripts he announced that "the primitive text is to be found in what is generally termed the Western family," viz., the Græco-Latin Codex Bezae (D) and its allies, and not in B ℵ, the two oldest uncials.[5] But notwithstanding this, in the case of Luke 22:17–21, by his careful investigation he came to the conclusion that the longer text of B ℵ is the original. Professor Clark has carefully noted the diverse groups of variants in D and the versions, and counted the letters in each omission, and thus discovered that the separate omissions consisted of 152 letters, which represented a column of the manuscript from which D and the Old Latin and Syriac Versions were copied.

For the sake of comparison and clearness I give Professor Clark's conclusion in his own words (but to get the weight of his illustrations his book should be read):

[1] *Oxford Magazine*, June 4, 1914.

[2] *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, August 14, 1914.

[3] *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1914.

[4] *The Journ. of Theological Studies*, p. 225, Vol. xvi, 1915.

[5] Albert C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, pp. vi, 78, 1914.

"Luke xxii: 17-21 Καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θυ ἔλθῃ. Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.

"Here there is great diversity in D and the versions, viz.:

καὶ δεξάμενος . . . . τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ (152) *om.* 𝔖^{vg} (the Peshitta) with some support from 𝔏^{b}=(Bohaerica).

καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον . . . τὸ σῶμά μου (69) comes before καὶ δεξάμενος in 𝔏^{b}. (=Old Latin b.)

The same passage+τὸ ὑπὲρ . . . διδόμενον (69+50=119) comes before δεξάμενος in 𝔖 and Diat. (= Old Syriac and Diatessaron).

D and 𝔏^{a} omit το υπερ υμων . . . . ἐκχυνόμενον (152).

The clue appears to be furnished by the fact that 𝔖^{vg} and D 𝔏^{a} (=Old Latin a) have separate omissions, each of which consists of 152 letters. This agreement is so extraordinary that it can hardly be due to accident. The natural explanation is that 152 letters represent a column in the manuscript from which D 𝔏𝔖 were copied. Here,[1] however, there is a difficulty, viz., that the words καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον . . . . τὸ σῶμά μου (69) intervene between the two blocks of 152.

This difficulty indicates the solution, viz., that the passage καὶ λαβων . . . . τὸ σῶμά μου was accidentally omitted.

To illustrate the point I write out the passage as

[1] This supposition would postulate an intermediate manuscript subsequent to the common archetype.

I conceive it to have stood in the ancestor of D𝔘𝔖. The most natural arrangement is that of two columns with fifteen lines:

Col. 1	Col. 2
και δεξαμε	το υπερ υμων
νος ποτηριον	διδομενον
ευχαριστη	τουτο ποιειτε
σας ειπε λαβε	εις την εμην
5 τε τουτο και	5 αναμνησιν
διαμερισατε	και το ποτηρι
εις εαυτους	ον ωσαυτως
λεγω γαρ υμιν	μετα το δειπ
οτι ου μη πιω	νησαι λεγων
10 απο του νυν	10 τουτο το ποτη
απο του γεν	ριον η καινη
νηματος της	διαθηκη εν
αμπελου εως ο	τω αιματι μου
του ἡ βασιλει	το υπερ υμων
15 α του θυ ελθη	15 εκχυνομενον

The missing words, viz.,

και λαβων αρ
τον ευχαρισ
τησας εκλασε
και εδωκεν
αυτοις λεγων
τουτο εστι
το σωμα μου

appear to have been inserted at the top of the column in the usual way. The result was that 𝔘[b] inserts them before καὶ δεξάμενος. The writer of 𝔖 saw that the first five lines of column 2 ought to follow τὸ σῶμά μου and transposed them also.

The writer of D omitted column 2 as meaningless without the missing words, while 𝔖[vg] whether by accident or not, omitted the whole of column 1. It is thus possible to explain these perplexing variants without recourse to the theory of willful interpolation."[1]

[1] Albert C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, pp. 77–79, 1914.

Professor Clark's treatment of the variants of this passage appears plausible, but whether his explanation is accepted or not the *double* brackets of W–H have lost their meaning, because the trend of textual criticism is to regard the variants due to discrepancy rather than to interpolation. And since the study of the sources of the Gospels has exalted the independence of Luke and revealed the probability of other primary authorities besides Mark and Q, the ambiguous reading in any case should not have had more than a *single* bracket.

(9) A Proto-Luke Tradition. The Longer Text, with its two cups and its institutional memorial injunction, contains a tradition of the Last Supper peculiar to the Third Gospel, which may have descended from Synoptic sources peculiarly Lucan. Dr. Streeter has shown recently that Luke was in possession of another authority comparable with Mark. The incongruity of reducing the Last Supper then to the compass of the Western Text of the Third Gospel is apparent if "the essential point is that Proto-Luke is entirely independent of Mark."[1]

Conclusions

After an attempt to give an impartial summary of the world's best scholarship on this passage, the following deductions seem conclusive:

1. We find that Luke intended to write an independent account of the Last Supper.

(a) He records our Lord's "desire" to keep the passover, and his request for the repetition of the eucharist

[1] B. H. Streeter, *The Hibbert Journal*, p. 112, October, 1921.

istic supper for a memorial, not recorded by the other Synoptists.

(b) We find that he had original sources for the passion narrative not used by Mark and Matthew, which qualified him to give a fuller report.

2. Though Westcott and Hort's principles of Textual Criticism are universally approved, their theories of "Neutral Text" and "Western Non-Interpolation" under the hands of critics have undergone considerable change. And as for this passage scholarship has been about evenly divided, consequently the "*double brackets*" should disappear, and the ambiguous evidence be distinguished, like "those about which there is reasonable doubt, by simple brackets."

3. The Harmonistic Text *b e* is inadequately sustained, and is discredited because when v. 19 is thus transposed, the cup bears no relation to the blood of Christ, and is discordant with the history of the Communion in the New Testament.

4. The original text of Luke 22:15–21 was longer than that represented by D, *a*, *ff*, *i*, *l*. This Western text is rejected because it is deficient in documentary evidence, and also is attended by too many inherent difficulties; and is objectionable in that it transforms the order of the Bread and Cup, and is silent as to the meaning of the meal. To follow this text would be to remove the Lord's Supper from the Gospels and raise doubt as to whether Jesus is the author of the Eucharist. A believer in the Christian religion instinctively disapproves a text that removes the sacramental institution from the Gospels, and leaves its origin and purpose under a question mark.

5. The history of the Lord's Supper in the New

Testament Church, and in early Christian literature, with the Cup after the Bread, and with commemorative reference to the blood of Christ, demands a text of Luke such as is found in the Greek Codices ℵ ABCLW, etc. This text-form sustained by an imposing testimony of manuscripts, and with important array of historic key-words, is necessary to and consistent with primitive practice. The testimonies of Matthew and Mark are incomplete as to the character of the Last Supper; and it is the Longer Text of Luke that discloses its memorial and sacramental character, as a request of our Lord, as confirmed by Paul and the literature and practice of the Apostolic Church.

THE LAST SUPPER

Introduction

How was the Last Supper celebrated? That is a question that interests every Christian. But where so much is uncertain and controversial, only partial and imperfect sidelights can be expected. But since the presence of the memorial table ever carries the communicant into the Upper Room, it is well that we heed the promptings of the love which attempts again and again to reproduce the probable details of the tender and hallowed events of that evening meal.

The Mosaic law prescribes little as to the mode of celebrating the Passover, but Jewish literature of the Christian era (200–1200 A. D.) acquaints us with a rich and complicated ritual. But gathered as it has been from unsystematic records and Rabbinical comments, some of which are not as old as the Gospels, it would

be injudicious to press a close comparison between its items and the incidents of the Last Supper.[1]

It appears that the outline of the ritual was fixed, but the Haggadah and Benedictions were free and extempore. Comparison of the Bible accounts with the later Jewish rituals and the immemorial passover customs (Mischna, *Pesach* 10) still observed in the changeless East indicate that the primary features have not changed.

The chief incidents of the Supper are readily identified—the "reclining at the table," "the Haggadah" (showing forth),[2] the handing of "the sop dipped in the dish," "the breaking of bread," "the giving of thanks," the passover body—"this is my body," "the fruit of the vine," "the cup of blessing," and the closing "hymn."

I am far from believing that Jesus (or the apostles later) adhered closely to any formula, for ritualism is foreign to the spirit of the gospel, yet such expressions as "the new covenant in my blood," and "This do in remembrance of me," place it beyond doubt that our Lord had the passover in mind. But what was the order He followed, and even what words He employed, are unknown, for the order was rudimentary and the Aramæan His vernacular. But to attempt a recon-

---

[1] The oldest source of the Passover Ritual is the Mischna, which received its present form towards the end of the third century of the Christian era, under Rabbi Judah Hakkadosch. The additions of the Talmud (the Josephtha a little later than the Mischna, and the two Gemaras), and comments of rabbinical writers supply much that bears on the paschal ritual.

I avoid the rabbinical paschal ritual controversies, and omit the convivial songs designed to enliven the modern service.

[2] 1 Cor. 11:26

struction of the Last Supper from the sources available cannot but help to contribute materially to an intelligent understanding of the Lord's Supper.

In attempting a reproduction of the Last Supper we are confronted at the start with controversial questions requiring more space for discussion than we have at our disposal, such as: What was the relation of the Last Supper to the Passover? What authentic remnants of the Last Supper are preserved in the early liturgies?

The Synoptists represent the Last Supper as a true passover, while according to the Fourth Gospel the crucifixion was antecedent to the passover. Scholars of ability have disparaged the possibility of harmonizing this discrepancy.[1]

But all Evangelists agree that the crucifixion was on Friday, therefore the Last Supper was instituted on Thursday evening.

1. *According to John that Supper was an ordinary meal.*

(a) The feet-washing was a menial work not to be thought of on Nisan 14th.

(b) The departure of Judas after receiving the sop to purchase necessary things for the feast (John 13: 29) implies that the markets were open and the passover not yet observed.

(c) The Jews would not enter the Prætorium that they might not defile themselves, but might eat the passover.

---

[1] W. Sanday, D.D., *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, pp. 148–151, New York, 1905. R. M. Wooley, B.D., *Liturgy of the Primitive Church*, p. 65, Cambridge, 1910. J. H. Srawley, D.D., *The Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 7, Cambridge, 1913.

(d) John calls the day of crucifixion the "Preparation of the Passover" (John 19:14).

(e) The Sanhedrin assembled on Friday morning, which would be improper on a passover.

2. *The Synoptists unquestionably represent the Last Supper as a true passover.*

(a) The Upper Room was secured for the Paschal celebration.

(b) Jesus sent two of His disciples on Nisan 13th to "make ready the passover."

(c) On Thursday evening (Nisan 14th), "when the hour was come" Jesus sat down and the apostles with Him, to eat that which had been prepared.

(d) He said to His passover company, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you, before I suffer."

(e) John's meal with the *sop* (ψωμίον, John 13:26) is the same as that of the Synoptists.

(f) Pilate set free a criminal at the feast (κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν Matt. 7:15). Zahn believes that this could be only on the first day of the feast proper, the 15th of Nisan.

(g) The references to Jesus as the paschal lamb favor the idea that the Last Supper was a true passover (1 Cor. 5:7, 8).

1. As a solution of the discrepancy some authorities assume that Jesus kept an anticipated passover a day earlier.[1]

2. An alternative theory is that Jesus did not keep the actual passover with His disciples, but only the *Kiddusch*, a consecrated meal preceding the Sabbath and great festivals, and that He purposed to keep it

[1] Rev. J. C. Lambert, B.D., *The Sacraments of the New Testament*, p. 256, Edinburgh, 1903.

at Pentecost, like those who could not keep it Nisan 14th.

But if our Lord did not keep the passover, or failed to carry out His purpose (Luke 22:15), we do not find any intimation of it in the Synoptists, and the objections based on the Fourth Gospel are largely rabbinical and should not be unduly pressed.[1] Peter did not object to the feet-washing on rabbinical ground, and probably our Lord had no sympathy with legalistic restrictions and ceremonials that were not vital. Entering a Gentile house disqualified the person only until evening, so he might purify himself for an evening passover. Likewise the purchases of Judas may have been deferred for lack of money in the daytime, but since the purchases were works of relief and benevolence, they may have been as justifiable as healing on the Sabbath.

3. No great weight should attach to the fact that no passover lamb is mentioned in connection with the Last Supper, for I seriously question that every family or company in Jerusalem were able to secure a paschal lamb, if Josephus' account is approximately correct as to the multitudes in attendance.

The Passover Ritual[2] and the incidents of the Last

---

[1] "For so decidedly are we of opinion that the Savior, according to the unmistakable testimony of the first three Evangelists, celebrated the Passover with his disciples on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, and at this time instituted the holy Eucharist; consequently the apparently contradictory statement of St. John has to be brought into accord with it, and not the reverse."

Dr. G. Bickell, *The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual*, p. 161, Edinburgh, 1891.

[2] Albert Merx, *Die vier Kanonischen Evangelien*, S. 428, Berlin, 1900. Rabbi William Rosenau, *Seder Haggadah*, New York, 1905.

Supper are here tabulated, but the arrangement is tentative and only suggestive.

The Passover Order

I. The Consecration of the Festival.
II. The Washing of Hands.
III. The Karpas, or eating Lettuce, Chervil, etc.
IV. Breaking the Unleavened Loaf.
V. The Haggadah.
VI. The Second Washing of Hands.
VII. The Unleavened Bread Brought Forth.
VIII. The Bitter Herbs Eaten.
IX. The Wrapping Together.
X. Eating the Paschal Lamb.
XI. The Aphikomen.
XII. The Grace After Meat.
XIII. The Hallel Singing.
XIV. The Benediction.

The Last Supper

	Matt.	Mark	Luke	John	Paul
1. Assembled in the Upper Room	26:20	14:18	22:14	.....	
2. The Strife for Position at the Table.....	.....	.....	22:24	13:4–16	
3. The Feetwashing.....	.....	.....	.....	13:4–6	
4. Jesus Receives a (Paschal) Cup	.....	.....	22:17	.....	
5. Prediction of the Betrayal...	26:21	14:18	22:21–23	13:21–26	
6. The Sop and Departure of Judas.....	.....	.....	.....	13:30	
7. Jesus Took Bread, etc.....	26:26	14:22	22:19	.....	1 Cor. 11:24
8. The Cup After Supper.....	26:27	14:23	22:20	.....	1 Cor. 11:25
9. Peter Consoled.	26:33	14:29	22:31–33	.....	
10. The Disciples Comforted.....	.....	.....	.....	14:1–16	

11. The Intercessory Prayer.... .... 17:1–26
12. Hymn Singing and Departure. 26:30 14:26 22:39

The Upper Room

Through the hospitality of the unknown disciple, who loaned the Upper Room "furnished and ready," the table doubtless was set at his expense, but the paschal lamb, which in an impressive moment with trumpet blasts and solemn service of priests had been slain in the Temple Court that afternoon, and its blood caught and cast at the base of the altar of sacrifice, was likely provided, like other essentials, through the efficiency of the "two disciples," who had been sent to "make ready the passover."[1]

"When it was evening" (Thursday, Nisan 14th),

[1] The Paschal Table for many centuries back has been laid out after this manner: "Before the service begins, a large dish is placed on the table in front of the 'Baki' (master of the house, or conductor of service appointed by him, so named because he is a man of experience), containing the following articles:

(a) Three '*mazzoth*,' '*azyms*,' or flat cakes of unleavened bread lying one above another, and each covered with a napkin. (According to Maimonides two loaves were considered sufficient in the time of the temple. Dr. G. Bickell, *The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual*, p. 117, 1891.)

(b) A certain quantity of lettuce, celery, or similar vegetable, with a vessel containing salt water, or vinegar.

(c) The *maror*, or 'bitter herbs,' generally consisting of the green sprouts of horse-radish, the gratings of the root.

(d) The *Charoseth*, a mixture of chopped apple, cinnamon, almonds, raisins and a goblet of wine, &c., made into a moist brown paste, to resemble and represent 'the clay,' in which the children of Israel once labored, Exod. 1:14.

(e) A roasted egg, to represent the *chagigah*, or the portion of the festive peace-offering of the 14th Nisan, which in the time of the temple sacrifice was always eaten by the family (who had offered it) at their paschal supper, when held at Jerusalem.

"the same night in which he was betrayed," Jesus came to "the guest chamber," which was a "large upper room," and as the house father welcomed each guest on his arrival with a kiss of more ardent affection than the customary oriental salaam, "peace be with you," for "knowing that his hour was come" (the hour which the love of God had beheld from the foundation of the world), "he loved his own" with a caressing demonstration (John 13: 1).[1]

(1) *Assembled in the Upper Room.* After the lamps were lighted Jesus "sat down" (reclined) at the centre of the low table, and the twelve apostles with Him as His passover company, who apparently with some confusion did not find their final positions at the table until after the prayer of consecration of the festival. In the time of Christ the Jews, after the manner of the Romans, in celebrating the passover reclined with the left elbow resting on the table, and the hand supporting the head, while the right hand was free. This reclining posture, used only by free men and nobles, was assumed as a recognition of their freedom.

I. *The Consecration of the Festival.* We infer that

(f) The *Zeroa*, or shoulder, a bone with a small piece of meat attached to it representing the paschal lamb, which was formerly partaken of after the chagigah.

"These two last (e) and (f), being mere memorials of sacrifices no longer existing are neither touched nor eaten during the following rites." T. L. Kingsbury, M.A., *The Spiritual Sacrifice and Holy Communion*, p. 140, 1900.

[1] The "Pax," or kiss of peace in the Communion Liturgy found its origin in this greeting. Like other parts it has been displaced to the middle of the Mass, before the anaphora, where its meaning is lost, for now it is used as a token of fellowship; whereas our Lord employed the customary Oriental Salaam, as an endearing Mizpah before his impending departure.

the presence of the table with its paschal offering impressed upon our Lord His impending death, and called forth the reduplicated Hebraism, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer,"[1] to fulfill its type and transform its memorial. For He "knew that his hour was come,"[2] and said to the disciples, "I say unto you, I will not eat it (again) until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."[3]

At the beginning of the paschal supper, as in modern time, a cup of wine is supposed to have been filled for each one of the company, for then Jesus "received a cup" (called the cup of the *Kiddusch*,[4] or *consecration*), and arose and gave "thanks." The whole company stood with Him, participating in the thanksgiving for the fruit of the vine and welcoming the feast; and received their portion after He had said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves."[5]

After the blessing[6] they all reclined and drank this first paschal cup.

---

[1] Luke 22: 15. [2] John 13: 1. [3] Luke 22: 16.

[4] It is uncertain whether the cup of Luke 22: 17 was the cup of the *Kiddusch*, or the cup of the *Haggadah*.

The four cups of the Passover Ritual were designated as follows:

(a) The cup of *Kiddusch*, or consecration of the day (כוס של קדוש היום). This cup introduced the festival. A similar cup was drunk in the evening before every Sabbath, and before every feast.

(b) The cup of *Haggadah* (כוס של הגדה).

(c) The cup of blessing (כוס של בוכת המונו).

(d) The cup of *Hallel*, and blessing of the song (כוס של הלל ושל ברכת חשיר). T. L. Kingsbury, M.A., *op. cit.*, p. 139, Cambridge, 1900.

[5] Luke 22: 17.

[6] The customary words of thanksgiving are the following, but if then existent, would hardly be adopted by our Lord: "Blessed art Thou Jehovah our God, king of the universe, who hast created the fruit of

(2) *Contention for position at the table.* Notwithstanding the greeting, "Peace be with you," and the solemnity of the historic memorial, the disciples were at variance with the requirements of the hour and the spirit of the kingdom. For in approaching the table there arose a contention among them concerning the occupation of the place of honor,[1] which was quelled only by our Lord's rebuke and declaration that in the Messiah's kingdom service is the badge of honor. Therefore, He immediately with a practical illustration represents Himself as their servant, and still claims them as His loyal friends, saying: "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth. But ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations."[2]

II. *The Washing of Hands.* After drinking the first cup, as a beginning of the paschal ceremonies it was customary for the officiator and all to arise and wash

---

the vine! Blessed art Thou Jehovah our God, king of the universe, who hast chosen us from among all peoples, and exalted us from among all languages, and sanctified us with Thy commandments! And Thou hast given us, O Jehovah our God, in love, the solemn days for joy, and the festivals and appointed seasons for gladness, and this day of unleavened bread, the season of our freedom, a holy convocation, the memorial of our departure from Egypt. For us Thou hast chosen, and us hast Thou sanctified, from among all nations, and Thy holy festivals with joy and with gladness hast Thou caused us to inherit. Blessed art Thou, O Jehovah, who sanctifiest Israel and the appointed seasons! Blessed art Thou, Jehovah king of the universe, who hast preserved us alive and sustained us and brought us to this season."

This prayer undoubtedly is of great antiquity, but Edersheim remarked: "In regard to many of these prayers I cannot help suspecting that they rather indicate the spirit and direction of a prayer than embody the *ipsissima verba*." A. Edersheim, *The Temple and Its Service*, p. 205, London, 1874.

[1] Luke 22:24.

[2] Luke 22:27, 28.

their hands, with a benediction,[1] in preparation for eating the *Karpas*. It was evidently at this time that Jesus proceeded to wash the disciples' feet, for John says that "Supper had come" (καὶ δείπνου γινομένου)[2] when that service took place.

(3) *Washing the disciples' feet.* When Jesus rose "from supper," before the ceremony of *washing hands*, He did an unusual thing, for He "laid aside His garments and took a towel and girded himself," like a slave ready for the lowest service, and "poured water into a bason and began to wash the disciples' feet."[3]

This act doubtless served a twofold purpose—it fulfilled the customary oriental hospitality and contributed comfort to the unsandaled feet, and proved an object lesson of humility, to rebuke the self-seeking of those who sought chief place at the table.[4] "I have given you an example,[5] that ye also should do as I have done to you."[6] After these preliminaries the table was brought forward and the company took their seats.

III. *The Karpas.* According to Jewish custom, bitter herbs, consisting of lettuce, chervil, or parsley dipped in salt water or vinegar, with a suitable bene-

[1] "Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, who hath sanctified us with Thy commandments and hath commanded us concerning the washing of hands." John Lightfoot, *The Temple Service*, p. 148, London.

[2] John 13: 2. [3] John 13: 4, 5. [4] Luke 22: 24–30.

[5] Feet-washing was given as an example of service and humility, and not as a church ordinance. For it occurred as an incident in the celebration of the Passover, and not in intimate connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper; therefore, it never was observed in connection with the Eucharist in the early church. "Washing the saints' feet" was an act of hospitality, classified with good works, but was never mentioned as an ordinance of the church.

[6] John 13: 15.

diction,[1] were served to each of the disciples. These bitter herbs were in commemoration of Israel's passage through the Red Sea, and served as an entree, or side-dish to sharpen the appetite, for it was obligatory to eat heartily.

IV. *Breaking the Unleavened Cake.*[2] In the modern passover supper it is customary to have on a salver two or three round cakes of unleavened bread, lying one above the other, each folded in a separate napkin. The middle cake is broken, and one half of it is set aside,[3] or hidden as *Aphikomen*, to be eaten at the close of the service. The unleavened bread commemorated Israel's poverty and the severity of the Egyptian servitude and their deliverance in haste.

(4) *The Second Paschal Cup* (called Cup of the *Haggadah*) *is filled.* Every goblet is filled again with mingled wine, and the youngest person at the table asks: "Why is this night distinguished from all other nights? On other nights we may eat either leavened or unleavened bread, while to-night we eat only unleavened bread," etc.

V. *The Haggadah* (shewing forth, or annunciation).

---

[1] The following brief prayer was offered: "Blessed be Thou, O Jehovah our God, king of the universe, creator of the fruit of the earth."

[2] The unleavened loaf was called "azym," meaning without leaven (ζύμη, leaven, or ferment; Hebrew מצה *mazzah*, pl. מצות, *mazzoth*).

[3] According to the Talmud, in order to arouse the inquisitiveness of the children, several things are done; such as eating the bitter herbs, hiding a piece of the unleavened cake, and removing the dishes from the table. But at present, the dishes are not removed, but the leader lifts the dish with the unleavened bread saying: "This is the bread of affliction which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt; whoever is hungry, come and eat; whoever is in need, come and make the Passover with us (this year here, next year in the land of Israel; this year much as slaves, next year altogether free, &c.").

The master of the feast, uplifting the unleavened bread, answers the numerous questions in accordance with the traditional instructions:[1] "When we were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt, God delivered us with a strong hand and outstretched arm. And had God not delivered our fathers from Egyptian bondage, who knows but that we, our children, and our children's children, would have been compelled to serve Pharaoh? Therefore, even though all of us were wise, intelligent, learned, and well versed in our Law (*Torah*), ours is the duty to rehearse the story of our deliverance."

The Haggadah was apparently simple and largely extempore, but the accumulated sayings of Rabbis which have crowded into it indicate that there was a skeleton of observances which were fixed, and which like some benedictions were orally spoken.[2] For Rabbi Gamaliel, the teacher of St. Paul, said: "Whoever does not explain three things in the Passover has not fulfilled the duty incumbent upon him. These three things are: the Passover lamb, the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs. *The Passover lamb* means that God passed over the blood-sprinkled place of the houses of our fathers in Egypt; *the unleavened bread* means that our fathers were delivered out of Egypt (in haste); and *the bitter herbs* mean that the Egyptians made bitter the lives of our fathers in Egypt."[3]

[1] Deut. 6: 12.

[2] As the Haggadah was an oral discourse without specified length, intended to instruct the company in God's marvelous guidance of Israel, it is probable that our Lord gave instead his table talk with predictions of his betrayal and suffering (Mark 14: 18–21; John 13: 21–30).

[3] *Pesach*, x, 15.

The Haggadah, after relating various paschal observances expounded by distinguished Rabbis, proceeds to enumerate everything of importance in the eventful history of Israel, such as the idolatry of Terah, the covenant with Abraham, and the deliverance from Egypt, interspersed with responsive services and antiphonal Psalms (113–114). After an instructive discourse, a short prayer[1] was said and the second cup, called the cup of the Haggadah, was emptied.

VI. *The Second Washing of Hands* is directed in the Passover Ritual, with the same prayer as before. This washing of hands was important because preparing for the feast proper.

VII. *The Unleavened Bread Brought Forth.* Rabbinical authorities punctiliously state that the benediction was to follow, not to precede, the breaking of bread, and the broken loaf was taken because it was the bread of poverty, "and the poor have not whole loaf, but broken pieces." Edersheim observes that since the *fraction* here precedes the *thanksgiving*, the institution of the Eucharist must be further on.[2]

---

[1] "Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the universe, Who hast redeemed us and our fathers from Egypt, and hast spared us until this night to eat on it unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Mayest Thou, Jehovah our God, and God of our fathers, help us to enjoy in peace, holidays and festivals in time to come; and through the growth of the spirit, of which Jerusalem is emblematic, mayest Thou aid us more especially to rise to the lofty heights of the Passover message, so that we may ever feel impelled to thank Thee in new song for our deliverance and redemption.

Blessed art Thou, Jehovah, Who hast redeemed Israel.

Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the universe, Who createst the fruit of the vine."

[2] A. Edersheim, *The Temple and Its Service*, p. 208, London, 1874.

VIII. *Eating the Bitter Herbs* (*Maror*). Bitter herbs, such as green sprouts of horse-radish, were dipped in a thick sauce called *charoseth*, and after a short prayer[1] were distributed by the officiator to each member of the paschal company. This second eating of bitter herbs (*Maror*), dipped in the clay-like charoseth, was a memorial of Israel's bitter servitude. "They made their lives bitter in hard service, in clay and in brick," i. e., in making bricks of clay (Exod. 1:14).

(5) *Prediction of the Betrayal.* Pieces of unleavened bread with bitter herbs between them, like a sandwich, were wrapped together, and dipped in the *charoseth*, and handed to each one of the company. This apparently was the place in the service where Jesus, with the bitter herbs in His hand, "was troubled in spirit,"[2] and said, "Verily I say unto you that one of you shall betray me."[3] The disciples were completely unstrung by the predictions and forebodings of that night, and while apprehensive of impending calamity each one dispelled the imputation and invited exposure with, "Is it I, Lord?"[4] Then John, bending back on his elbow so that his head rested on Jesus' breast, asked privately, in compliance with Peter's promptings, "Lord, who is it?" Jesus answered, probably in an undertone, "He it is for whom I shall dip the sop and give it him."[5]

[1] "Blessed art Thou, Jehovah our God, King of the universe, Who hast sanctified us with thy commandments and given us commandment concerning the eating of the bitter herbs, called *merorim*," Exod. 12:8.

[2] John 13:21–30.

[3] Matt. 26:21; Mark 14:18.

[4] Matt. 26:22. [5] John 13:26.

IX. *The Wrapping Together.* The *sop* apparently was that portion of unleavened bread and bitter herbs "wrapped together," and "dipped in the dish" of *charoseth.*[1] "After the sop he went out immediately."[2] It was a sad moment, for there is no sadder saying in Scripture than, "I guarded them, and not one of them is lost, but the son of perdition" (John 17:12). One soul lost.

(6) *The Departure of Judas.* When the inevitable could not be averted, when divine entreaties found no human response in Judas, and when further friendly companionship served only to render the downfall more pitiable, Jesus, longing for a quiet moment with the rest, said, "What thou doest, do quickly." Judas then departed straightway, "and it was night." Jesus wanted a moment that evening to infuse Himself into His followers, so that after that night, like Paul, each one could say, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." When a needle is brought in contact with a magnet it receives something which it did not possess before, and partakes of something that is inherent in the magnet, just so each communion should be a moment to charge or energize the disciple with the "divine nature."

As Judas left before partaking of the paschal lamb it is certain that he was not present to partake of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, the abrupt announcement, "Behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table" (Luke 22:21) is misplaced, and should precede the Eucharist, as an incident of the passover proper, as recorded by Mark (14:18) and Matthew (26:21).

[1] John 13:24–26. [2] John 13:30.

In leaving the house thus without partaking of the paschal lamb he did an unusual thing. But his departure attracted no special attention, for as "he had the bag" it was thought that as treasurer he had gone to procure those "things" that they had "need of against the feast," or to "give something to the poor."[1]

The large temple gate was open even to midnight, and it would have been no violation of the passover custom to purchase a peace-offering for the poor, who crowded the temple courts for such donations. It was allowable also to procure the necessary provisions for the next day or for the Sabbath.

X. *Eating the Paschal Lamb.* In the national memorial, eating the paschal lamb with a special thanksgiving[2] was the culminating event of the passover. It was a complete and unbroken sacrifice devoted both as a sin-offering and peace-offering, so that none of it was to "remain until morning," because it represented the one family or company alone in complete and unbroken fellowship with God. Everything pertaining to the lamb was fixed and significant, but the festive offering called *Chagigah* was provided in accordance with the ability of the family and requirements of the occasion.[3] In the supper celebrated by

[1] John 13: 29.

[2] "Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, king everlasting, who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments, and commanded us concerning the eating of the sacrifice."

[3] "The *Chagigah* (literally, *festivity*), or festive offering, contributed largely to the festivity or entertainment. It was optional to use the *chagigah* from sacred things on the paschal night if the paschal lamb were not sufficient, then on the next day (15th), it was obligatory and had to be brought from *'cholin,'* such as tithes, firstlings, and devoted things." A. Edersheim, *The Temple and Its Service*, pp. 186–187, 1874.

Jesus and the disciples no mention is made of the paschal lamb; but this is not strange, for the Gospels record the unusual incidents of the feast, and not the ordinary steps which were so well known. But they do assert that Jesus went to Jerusalem "to eat the passover," and did sit at meat with the twelve "on the first day of unleavened bread," "on which the passover must be sacrificed."

The Lord's Supper

(7) *Jesus Took Bread.* The paschal supper before it was finished was merged into a higher and nobler memorial, called the Lord's Supper. Though immediately connected with the passover, it was at the same time so distinctly separate from it as to form none of its courses. Before the old was completed, the new was begun; for, "as they were eating (the paschal lamb), Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said,[1] Take, eat; this is my body,"[2] "which is given for you: This do in remembrance of me."

This to the disciples was an entirely new procedure, but it so impressed them with its sweet fellowship that through them it has become the communion ideal of all ages. As the thanksgiving at the breaking of the loaf was extempore the formula was not recorded; and we are at a loss to conceive what was the benediction employed by Jesus.

(8) *The Cup After Supper.* The communion of the

[1] Matt. 26:26; Luke 22:19.

[2] The words of the Mishnah (Pes. x. 3) are: "While the Sanctuary stood, they brought before him his body of (or for) the Passover." A. Edersheim, *op. cit.*, p. 198, London, 1874.

apostolic age was accompanied by a conversational homily; we can then understand how the blessing for the bread, which was taken as they were eating the paschal supper, was separated by a considerable interval from the cup, for it was not until "after supper" (μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι), according to Paul and Luke, that, "He took a cup and gave thanks, and gave to them, and they all drank of it." And He added, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

Like the institution of the loaf, that of the cup also was accompanied by spiritual reflections. Jesus said, "Now I go unto Him that sent me," and "Because I have spoken these things unto you, sorrow hath filled you." The deep shadows of sorrow, as well as the perfect peace and complacency reflected in John 15 and 16, imply that the discourse which they contain, in which Jesus unfolded the principles of His kingdom, and represented Himself as the "true vine," the believer's life, and promised the Paraclete, as the Christian's companion, were delivered towards the close of the Supper. "Ye therefore now have sorrow, but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice," John 16:22. "These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye may have peace. In the world ye have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world" (John 16:33).

This narrative will not be complete without a brief account of the closing ceremonies of the passover as celebrated by the Jews.

In Jerusalem in the time of the temple, the paschal supper ended with eating the paschal lamb on the unleavened bread; but away from Jerusalem, and in the dispersion, where no lamb was sacrificed, the unleavened bread "wrapped together" was the last food.

XI. *The Aphikomen* (אפיקומן). The *aphikomen* consisted of half

of the second unleavened loaf set aside for this purpose. It is not known when the *aphikomen* was added to the original supper. The modern Jews with whom I have conversed, do not think that the *aphikomen* was concealed as dessert, but simply set aside as a device to keep the children awake to hear the *Haggadah*.

In the distribution of the *aphikomen*, the officiator gave a piece not less than an olive to each one of the company; and then the third cup was filled, called the "cup of blessing" (1 Cor. 10: 16).

To-day in every Jewish home, just after the third paschal cup is emptied the door is thrown open to admit Elijah the prophet, as forerunner of the Messiah, for according to Jewish tradition this was a moment of hope and ardent aspiration, and if Jesus took this cup, and made it the "cup of the new covenant," he connected his dying love with the symbol of this expectant hope!

Edersheim said: "there cannot be any reasonable doubt that this was the cup which our Lord connected with his own Supper." In the Passover Ritual, the Hallel is completed before the fourth cup is drunk, but in the Lord's Supper the singing is after the cup, therefore the eucharistic cup could not have been the fourth cup.

(9, 10) *Peter and the Disciples Consoled.* With the departure of Judas from the Upper Room restraint vanished and the atmosphere became sacred and confiding, for when the traitor "was gone out" our Lord addressed the eleven as "little children," and delivered unto them His parting message and compassionately prayed that their faith might fail not.[1] He not only predicted the fall of Peter, but also said, "All ye shall be offended in me this night." "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered abroad."[2] This prediction undoubtedly distressed the disciples, and very fittingly called forth the great comforting words of Christ, "Let not your heart be troubled; you believe—believe in God and also in me."[3]

(11) *Our Lord's Intercessory Prayer.* If the discourses of John 14–16 constituted our Lord's *Hagga-*

[1] Luke 22: 32. [2] Matt. 26: 31–32. [3] John 14: 1.

dah, or table-talk, it seems that the "intercessory prayer" of John 17 took the place of the "*Grace After Meat.*"

Hitherto Jesus had retired to mountain heights and distant wilderness to pray, but now for the first time His followers are allowed to listen as "He lifted up His eyes to heaven," the region of light and love, and poured out His soul in spiritual mediation for them. This great prayer of our Lord commends His disciples to God, saying "they are Thine," therefore "keep them in Thy name," for "they are not of the world," but belong to another realm (John 17:9, 11, 16). It was also an appeal to the Father to "sanctify them in the truth" (17:17) or to consecrate them for their mission, to carry on their work in peace and brotherly love. He prayed for the unity of the church, that its unity might be like the harmony of the Godhead ("That they may be one even as we are") that through its visible, demonstrable unity "the world may believe."

(12) *The Parting Hymn* (Matt. 26:30, and Mark 14:26). They sang a hymn and went out beyond the Kedron. Whether that sacred song was one of the usual paschal hallels (Psa. 115–118), or not, it was doubtless, like all sacred melodies, the overflowing joy and exaltation of grateful hearts.

XII. *Grace After Meat.* The blessing after meat, followed by the benediction for the third cup, which stood before them, was preceded by a Psalm. After an antiphonal thanksgiving, several prayers are offered to God, for His abounding grace, for the redemption of Israel, for the house of David, and for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, etc. Then an invocation is made that the All-merciful may send abundant blessings on the house and on the table, and send Elijah the prophet (of happy memory), that he may announce to us tidings of happiness, salvation, and consolation.

After these benedictions, thanksgiving is offered for the fruit of the vine, and the third cup is drunk in a reclining position.

At this time, the cup poured out for the prophet Elijah is lifted up, and the front door opened, as if expecting the harbinger of the Messiah, and a few biblical petitions for the punishment of the heathen are sent forth at the open door (Psa. 79:6, 7; 69:24; and Lam. 3:66).

XIII. *The Hallel of Egypt.* This second part of the Hallel consisted of Psalms 115–118, which were read in unison, by the officiator and the company in alternate verses.

Part of Psalm 118 was chanted by the company, and followed by a short hymn, beginning with:

"All Thy works praise Thee," &c.

Then the "Great Hallel" (Psalm 136), was recited; followed by a Hebrew refrain, by the company. This was followed by an ancient song of thanksgiving:

"The soul of every living thing
Doth bless Thy name, O Lord our God," &c.

Then two hymns of modern date are now employed; the first is used on the first paschal night, and recalls God's mercies to Abraham and to Isaac, on the Passover night, while the company join in the refrain:

"And it came to pass at midnight," &c.

The second hymn used on the second night recounts God's marvelous deeds on special passover nights, with the choral response:

"This is the sacrifice of the passover," &c.

The passover in its vigil and prayers voiced the Jewish expectation for some unusual thing to happen on passover night, such as the coming of the Messiah and their final redemption; hence after a choral song, there was a solemn announcement: "Next year in Jerusalem," before the usual thanksgiving for the fruit of the vine, and the drinking of the fourth paschal cup.

(In the modern Ritual a number of merry songs are sung.)

XIV. *Benediction.* The service concludes with the announcement: "The commemoration of the passover is now accomplished, according to its order, and all its statutes and customs!

"O Holy One! Thou who dwellest on high raise up a people of whom it was said, Who can number them? O hasten to lead the established plant (Israel), and to bring the redeemed to Zion with joyful song."

Much of the foregoing is redundant, but like the Evangelists we may come through the preliminaries of the passover to find in the words of the Master in

the Lord's Supper, the "bread of life," and as He said to the woman of Samaria, "the gift of God," the "living water," welling up into eternal life. From the historical outline the following deductions seem self-evident:

(1) The passover was a historical festival, and maintained its memorial character because it commemorated Israel's national redemption. It emphasized the existence of God, and His miraculous fulfillment of His promises and redemption of His people. In like manner the Lord's Supper is a sacramental institution, commemorating Christ as the Lamb of God, who "died for our sins according to the Scriptures."

(2) In the Last Supper the Mosaic covenant was fulfilled, but the injunction, "This do in remembrance of me," implied a new supper with a new Haggadah. based on a new covenant.

(3) As the officiator at the passover made the feast to portray the tender mercy of God to Israel, so the one who presides at the Lord's Table should especially endeavor to present Christ our passover vitally present to faith in a helpful communion.

"For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ" (1 Cor. 5:7).

THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

"They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers," Acts 2:42.

All Christians will always be interested in the communion practice of the apostolic age, for the nearer we are to the fountain head the purer the stream. And we must believe that the institution ordained by

our Lord and reproduced by the apostles contained all the essentials of a valid sacrament. As the ordinances instituted by Jesus were remodelled on Jewish practices and symbolism, their injunctions needed not to be outlined in detail, since His new meanings were superimposed on some well-known historic forms.[1]

But the material for reproducing the Lord's Supper of the apostolic age is very meagre, and aside from the Gospels' accounts of the Last Supper, found in Matt. 26:26–30, Mark 14:22–25, and Luke 22:15–20, consists of only two or perhaps three references in Acts of the Apostles, 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11 (27:35); two in 1 Cor. 10:16–22, and 11:23–34; and the allusion to the agape found in Jude 12 (and doubtful reading in 2 Pet. 2:15).

It is true that early Christian literature supplies some interesting references to a few primitive practices that have descended from the apostolic age. At the beginning church organization was slow and halting, and the form of service and communion rites were simple and equally unfixed. We do not mean to say that there was no general understanding as to what the spirit and form of worship should be, for Jesus Himself exemplified it, and gave its ideal structure and wording in the Lord's Prayer. Prayer constituted the chief part of primitive service. The lections from the Law and Prophets, chants from the Psalter,

[1] "It cannot be too strongly insisted upon that what our Savior said to his disciples on that memorable night was meant to be intelligible to them then and there. . . . Loyal Jews as they were they felt it unnecessary to say, 'Lord, Moses has forbidden us to drink any blood; how then can we drink Thy Blood? or how canst Thou give us Thy Flesh to eat?'" Robert H. Kennett, D.D., *The Last Supper*, p. 48, Cambridge, 1921.

homilies, prayers borrowed from the synagogue service became the nuclei of later liturgical forms. But of the specific synagogue service in the time of Christ we know little except from the New Testament. It consists principally of Scriptural readings, hymns, prayers, and addresses, for the object of instruction, like a modern Protestant Church, and not of liturgical, priestly, and sacrificial service like the temple. Doubtless some ancient prayers, benedictions, and doxologies were occasionally repeated, and devout worshipers were followed or imitated in word and spirit. But the amount borrowed from the synagogue was very little, and the freedom of elaboration great, so that in the evolution of ritualism different liturgies grew up out of the worship of such churches as later became great diocesan centers.

While the Communion Service originally was largely non-liturgical (aside of perhaps some rudimentary thanksgiving prayers), and subject to the discretion of the presiding officer, the Liturgies, which date from the fourth century, unfortunately have built up solid and uncompromising barriers between Eastern and Western, and between Catholic and Protestant Churches.[1] The non-ritual churches adhere mainly to

[1] The Eastern and Western Churches hold so tenaciously to their respective rituals that any deviation, omission, or change is a disciplinary offense; yet the Roman rite, which has practically supplanted all others in the West since the sixteenth century, was originally local (simply diocesan for Rome), and even now is not used by all the Catholic Churches, for "the Ambrosian and Mozarabic rites still remain, the former in Milan, and the latter in Toledo and Salamanca; while the Greek rite is used in Southern Italy, Sicily, and Corsica." L. Wright, M.A., *The Eucharistic Office of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 13, London, 1919.

Scriptural authority, and maintain that the Church of Jesus Christ is "intentionally and constitutionally one" notwithstanding divisive creeds, polities, and liturgies; while the ritualists assume apostolic authenticity for the Liturgies and exalt patristic traditions and Conciliar decrees to the level of the Scripture.

In the investigation of the early Communion Service, Jerusalem naturally has priority, for the study of primitive practice directs us to the Last Supper and the Pentecostal days of the Church. Luke, who in recent critical research is pronounced a competent historian, was abundantly qualified to give a correct account of the sacrament, for he received his material directly by associations in Jerusalem and vicinity and in his travels, from those "who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke 1:2). He gives the history of the Church, as it existed first, in a Jewish community, and made up of Israelites, familiar with the ritual of their own nation. Those Jews confessing the name of Christ after Pentecost were added together as the *ecclesia* (Acts 2:47), but there was no church building, clerical distinctions, nor distinct church liturgy, and aside from the apostles' teaching and breaking of bread, it is doubtful if there was anything new or distinctively Christian in the worship of the disciples of that time.

The items stressed by Luke as faithfully observed by the new brotherhood were "the apostles' teaching and fellowship,[1] and the breaking of bread and the

[1] "Fellowship" (κοινωνία) referred to a definite part of the worship, re-acting in generosity to the "apostles' teaching," and expressing itself in public meals and fraternal relief, called "the daily ministration." In classical Greek the word referred to partnership, and asso-

prayers." These two couplets express the public and private interests of the new brotherhood. "The apostles' teaching and fellowship" represent the didactic and social life of the community and the relation of the disciples to the world; while the "breaking of bread and the prayers" were individual and private acts of worship peculiar to their own gatherings exclusively. These items represented the interests of the new brotherhood, rather than the order of worship of the assembly. The Eucharist was the pivot round which Christian worship revolved, but we find no prescribed ritual or prayers for its celebration till we reach the fourth century.[1] Doubtless there was a rudimentary structure, for Paul delivered certain traditions to the Corinthians, and praised them for keeping them (1 Cor. 11:2), and though their precise meaning is unknown, we are sure that they included decency and order (1 Cor. 14:40).

1. *The Apostles' teaching and fellowship.* The apostles' teaching is given first place, because Christianity began with instruction, or demonstration of the proposition that Jesus was the Messiah. The teaching and fellowship were public and general acts for the benefit of others, while breaking of bread and prayers were personal and spiritual acts of devotion. This teaching was not some formulated system of doctrine, or traditional deposit to be subscribed to, but had reference to the didactic teaching of the apostles, to prove

---

ciation; and in the New Testament to "gift, contribution, and alms," and seems here to find expression in the Agape, the counter-part of the "Breaking of Bread," which the Peschitta terms "the breaking of the Eucharist." The same is reflected in the Latin Text of *Codex Bezae*, which has "*et communicatione fractionis panis.*"

[1] The *Didache* is not supposed to have been the ritual of any church.

that Jesus who was rejected and crucified was the divinely acknowledged Messiah of prophecy. The apostles who were eye-witnesses to His resurrection testified to the Jews "that God had made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Acts 2:36). The discourse of Peter and John in Solomon's Porch is to the same effect, asserting that the Jews had "killed the Prince of life, whom God raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses" (Acts 3:15).

The apostles at first invariably availed themselves of the opportunity to preach to their countrymen, and made free use of the synagogues, which were open even to Gentiles, and whose service was for instruction and worship; while the temple principally was for sacrificial intercession, ceremonial purification and national atonement. Wherever hearing was available, whether in synagogues or among Gentile assemblies, the one theme was the Messiahship of the crucified Jesus and fellowship in the new kingdom (Acts 9:20). And undoubtedly the incidents connected with the death and resurrection of our Lord constituted the fundamental theme, when the disciples came together for the Breaking of Bread.

The "fellowship" consisted largely in the social life growing out of the apostles' teaching, and found special expression in the table-fellowship of the primitive church. We have in the Lord's Supper the survival of a wonderful fellowship, and the disciples of Christ will ever love to hover around Pentecost, to find in apostolic ideals and practice the joy and peace in which they delight. Though Christian fellowship has undergone some change, it continues the same in its spirit and aim.

Should there be any doubt as to the botanical place of an exotic, or unknown plant, its genus, fruit, and unchangeable fragrance can be determined at once and forever by the analysis of its first blossoms. Likewise, the fellowship of the apostolic church, the first flowering of Christianity, foreshadowed the wonderful social and saving mission of the Church, and its program for the betterment of the whole world. Those who would know the spirit and power of an uncorrupted church, prior to its contamination by heathen influences, must study the early fellowship of the apostolic church. Though the primitive disciples were poor and uncultured, the fellowship of the first Jerusalem church was ideal, genuinely philanthropic, and has never been surpassed. True the age was eleemosynary, and Messianic expectations perhaps were conducive to generosity, for when Jesus sent out the twelve, and the seventy, their message was such that no provision was necessary for their campaign, for to decline hospitality to the pairs that went forth would imply open rejection of the kingdom. But the fellowship was the reproduction of Jesus dispensing hospitality "unto each according as any had need." And in the joy of the new salvation, some like Barnabas were moved to sell their property and share with "any that lacked" (Acts 4:36, 37). But, though exemplary for similar emergencies, there was nothing compulsory or communistic in the measure, for Peter said to Ananias, "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whilst it remained, did it not remain thine own, and after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" (Acts 5:3, 4.)

2. *Breaking of Bread and the prayers.* The first chapters of Acts set forth the faith and fellowship of the primitive Christian community. The passage 2:46 is a summary of their twofold interests, as attendants upon the Temple worship, as Jews; and for the "Breaking of Bread" in accustomed households (κατ' οἶκον), as members of Christian assemblies. "They took their food with gladness and singleness of heart" (2:46), implying that the "fellowship" and "prayers" associated with the meal were sufficient to dissipate their discouragements and fortify their faith. At first the disciples doubtless observed the customary hours of prayer, fasts, and synagogue worship, but also attended their own gatherings (Acts 1:15; 12:12), and took counsel how to make their own organization distinctive and permanent. Their meetings had their inspiration in their remembrance of Jesus, and the meal time recalled His customary usage in "the Breaking of Bread" with simple forms of "blessing" or "thanksgiving." As the companies at these gatherings in time increased beyond the capacity of ordinary tables, the meal became merely symbolic or sacramental; so after some preliminary invocation, praise, and words of institution with prayer, or thanksgiving, the broken bread was distributed and the cup passed round, and their memorial character stressed after the example of the Last Supper.

It is probable that the evening meal frequently was a Lord's Supper, including both Agape and Eucharist.[1] But in a short time there grew up a distinction be-

[1] The Agape is not mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles, but the meal and its attending fellowship associated with the Eucharist is readily recognized.

tween the social Feast of Love (Jude 12:2; 2 Pet. 2:13) and the commemorative institution, or Eucharist; and then it became customary for the latter to be observed on Sunday, as a distinctively weekly Communion (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2), with more formality than at first in Jerusalem.

The primitive custom was so well known that Luke thought it unnecessary to go into detail, consequently there is no reference even to the "cup" in Acts.

At Troas the service consisted of a homily, or discourse for instruction, and culminated in a communion meal with "the breaking of bread"; but the record does not show whether there were lections, fraternal greetings, or the singing of psalms or hymns. The assembly room had "many lights" which imply that nocturnal gatherings were customary for the disciples, and since there is no intimation that their illumination had any symbolic significance, we believe their function was to exclude the possibility of unseemly and unchristian behavior.

These fragmentary notices are supplemented by the more specific account of the Lord's Supper supplied by Paul (1 Cor. 11:23f.), which apparently was the customary eucharistic tradition given to the Pauline churches.[1] It appears then that the Corinthians as-

[1] W. B. Frankland, M.A. (*The Early Eucharist*, p. 56, London, 1902), thinks that the celebration of the Eucharist in Pauline churches in the latter half of the first century was approximately as follows: "Weekly, in the evening, the Christian community, men and women, assembled and partook of a common meal, the primary outward aim of which was not the satisfaction of the appetite and the expression of good will, but the commemoration of our Savior. A discourse might precede, then thanks were offered reverently by one of those present; in the thanksgiving familiar short formulæ might be incorporated; at the close all answered Amen. The president stood to bless

sembled for a meal, which had at its close the eucharistic commemoration, and though not liturgical, the apostles' observation, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye shew forth the Lord's death until he come," reflects the Haggadah, as in the Last Supper, with the people saying "Amen" after the thanksgiving, as in the synagogue (1 Cor. 14:16). In these repetitions we have the first intimations that the Communion even in oral tradition might acquire a stereotype form.

These Communions with Agape (probably preceding them) were repasts consisting not only of bread and wine, but of all kinds of viands, afforded opportunity for feeding the poorer brethren, but soon became objectionable, because the richer families brought with them their own provision, and instead of waiting for the general distribution, practiced exclusiveness, self-indulgence, and excesses, and turned the repast into a private supper (ἴδιον δεῖπνον), 1 Cor. 11:21, 22. Paul regarded the whole meal strictly religious, a "Supper of the Lord" (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον) 1 Cor. 11:20, hence social excesses were out of place. In the abuses of the Agapæ the Corinthians forgot the unity of the one body, and the sense of brotherhood which culminated in the Eucharist.

In our study of the Lord's Supper of the apostolic age we find that the Breaking of Bread without such accessories[1] as liturgical formularies, clerical rites, and

and break the bread and pour the wine. These were then reverently partaken of by the congregation. The kiss of peace may have been exchanged at some stage of the service."

[1] "There is no allusion in the New Testament of any distinctive dress as worn either by the Apostles, or by persons of any grade in the Christian ministry, either while engaged in Divine Service or in

credal definitions was a vital factor in the permanent organization of the Church, and a rallying force for the introduction of the first attempt at social service, and for the ever-widening evangelization of the heathen world.

The Communion is a binding power, not only because it is an epitome of the gospel, comprising every element of our Lord's redeeming sacrifice, His love as a memento to inspire discipleship and loyalty, and His presence as a grace to strengthen and cheer; but had besides in its origin two popular elements, religious and social, which were lifted into a commemorative institution. For on the one hand, the "cup of blessing" and its "thanksgiving" recalled the Master and incidents of the paschal celebration, forever dear to the Jew; and, on the other hand, the "Fellowship" suggested the common meal familiar to oriental people, among whom the law of the desert made eating together a pledge of amity and protection. When our Lord fed the multitudes (and similarly at Emmaus) it is said, "He blessed, and brake the loaves, and he gave to the disciples to set before them" (Mark 6:41; 8:6; Luke 24:30). These specific acts, antedating the Last Supper, seem to have transferred themselves into the Love-feasts and Communion. But the social meal was also a heathen practice, consequently Paul admonished the Corinthians against the inconsistency of Christians partaking of idolatrous food taken from heathen altars, which implied fellowship with the pagan demons worshiped, saying, "Wherefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry" (1 Cor. 10:14).

---

every day life." F. E. Warren, B.D., *Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, p. 47, London, 1897.

The primitive Communion too had elements of strength in the character and faith of those who constituted the communion of saints; for, though of the poorer class, they were of heroic mold, and many like Barnabas, who "was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." The Christian faith, underlying all, was a marked contrast to the surrounding heathendom, for it recognized one God, free from the discreditable mythology, which clung round pagan deities, and through its sacred Scriptures (with which the mystery literature could not compare) presented an historic religion and Messianic hope, whose first note invariably was the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, universally proclaimed.

If we would restore the Church of Apostolic days with its times of refreshing, we must give more time and forethought to the Communion, that in the uplift of its simple and devotional celebration we may "see Jesus," and pray that His presence may be the companion, and joy, and peace of our hearts.

COMMUNION OF THE SUB-APOSTOLIC AGE

If we are to base our conclusions on the fragmentary data which antedate all church orders, we must infer that the communion service of the sub-apostolic age was simple and informal, modelled with discretionary freedom upon the Last Supper. But as a very early period the simplicity of the Lord's Supper began to disappear. Prevailing religious customs, both Jewish and pagan, were appropriated, and new names and figurative expressions of exotic origin rendered the communion more ritualistic and sensuous. A perusal of patristic writings acquaints us with a marked en-

largement of the communion vocabulary; and attending this expansion of terminology we discover elaboration of ceremony and embellishing of formularies.

The Supper at the close of the apostolic age was Judaistic in its terms and form, but by the fourth century it had been glossed by Hellenic vocabulary and ceremony.

The earlier writers were content with Scripture phraseology, and allude to the eucharistic elements as gifts and oblations only when interpreting types and prophecies, but never as propitiatory offerings. Whether we regard the gradual change which transpired as a legitimate development or a baneful deterioration depends somewhat upon our taste and conviction; whether we are in sympathy with ritualistic idealism or primitive simplicity.[1] The contact with the religion of pagan Rome, which was materialistic, influenced Christian worship in dress, posture, and action; and caused imitation of its magnificence with little attempt to elucidate its meaning.[2] The custom of keeping feast days according to the Cal-

[1] "But if on the one hand, this ritualistic over-estimation of the sacraments, as I have ventured by anticipation to call it, challenges us to a serious consideration of the subject, we are quite as insistently summoned to the same task by a decided tendency towards their under-estimation, if not their complete depreciation, which has sprung up within recent years in the field of critical scholarship." J. C. Lambert, B.D., *The Sacraments in the New Testament*, p. 3, Edinburgh, 1903.

[2] "It astonishes us that men like Sulla and Cæsar, who seem to us complete agnostics, could be the heads of the Roman religion. But so long as they performed the right ceremonies on the right day, with the right words and motions, no one insisted on inquiring what at the time was passing in their minds." Percy Gardner, Litt.D., *The Growth of Christianity*, p. 180, London, 1907.

endar, and say prayers with no meaning understood, and celebrating Mass in an unknown tongue came down through the centuries. The service of the Church of England was in an unknown tongue to the laity, and to many of the clergy, until changed by an act of Parliament, on March 8, 1548.[1]

In our study of the Communion of the sub-apostolic age, the chief things that arrest our attention are: (1) The time of its celebration. (2) The relation of the Supper to the Agape. (3) The manner of its celebration, and (4) Doctrinal changes and tendencies.

(1) *How the time for celebrating the Supper became established.* Though the first disciples were Jews, from a very early period Sunday became a day for Christian worship, but not with the restrictions of the Jewish Sabbath.[2] Therefore κυριακή became the term for *Lord's Day*, or Sunday. Towards the middle of the first century the Lord's Supper was celebrated as a meal in conjunction with or following the Agape. The disciples came together on the first day of the week to Break Bread, apparently in the evening (Acts 20:7, 11). This time suited the humble, or poor class, and was compatible with the Last Supper and the Agape which it followed. But according to Pliny's Letter to the Emperor Trajan, A. D. 112, by the beginning of the second century, the celebration, probably to avoid publicity, shifted from evening to

---

[1] H. B. Swete, D.D., *Services and Service-Books*, p. 114, London, 1914.

[2] "The observance of the Sunday was at first supplemental to that of the Sabbath, but in proportion as the gulf between the Church and the synagogue widened, the Sabbath became less and less important, and ended at length in being entirely neglected." Mgr. L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 47, London, 1904.

early morning (Duchesne, p. 7). After ascertaining the customary practice of the early disciples from two young women whom he had put to the cruel torture, he wrote to Trajan:

"They asserted that this was the sum and substance of their fault, or their error, namely that: They were wont on a fixed day to assemble before day-light and sing antiphonally a hymn to Christ as to a god, and to bind themselves by an oath, or by a sacrament (*sacramento*) to abstain from crime, and likewise to abstain from theft, robbery, adultery, and from breach of faith, and not to deny trust-money placed in their keeping when called upon to deliver it, and when this was over their custom was to depart, and meet together again to take food, but ordinary and harmless; and this indeed they ceased to do after my edict, wherein in accordance with your orders I had forbidden clubs." *Epistle* 96.

This first bit of history outside of the New Testament implies that there was a stated day (*stato die*) for worship, presumably Sunday, with two meetings. Whether the *agape* was separated from the eucharist at that time, in Bithynia, is not clear.[1] As to the *sacramentum*, it is more likely that a formal oath or pledge against crime was meant, and not a sacrament in a theological sense. Lightfoot (Ignatius i. 51) is inclined to the view that the earlier gathering was for the eucharist and the later for the agape. After it became customary to celebrate communion in the early morning, it was natural for those of Jewish birth to precede it by the "morning service" of the synagogue. Thus the two services, agape and euchar-

[1] "The laws of imperial Rome were very strict against anything in the nature of *sodolitas*, or guilds for social or other non-religious purpose, which involved a number of people meeting together."

In order to avoid falling under this law the *agapæ* were abandoned in the province of Bithynia-Pontus, ruled over by Pliny, and probably elsewhere as well. F. E. Warren, *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church*, p. 134, London, 1897.

ist, became welded together, and included praise, prayers, and reading modelled on the common worship of the synagogue. But still in the middle of the second century there was no general uniform service, for according to Justin the Communion occasionally was celebrated after baptism (*Apolog.* 65). But we know through the *Didache*[1] that the eucharist had become the central act of Christian worship, and that it was celebrated on the Lord's Day:

"On the Lord's own day, assemble together and Break Bread and give thanks, having confessed your transgressions, so that your sacrifice may be pure." *Didache*, Chap. 14.

"It is on Sunday that we all make the common assemblage, because it is the first day, on which God made order by changing darkness and matter, and on the same day Jesus Christ our Savior arose from the dead." Justin, *Apolog.*, 1, 67.

Tertullian also speaks of celebration before "daybreak." "The sacrament of the eucharist, though it was commanded by our Lord at meal-time and to all, we take in assemblies before daybreak (*antelucanis coetibus*), and from the hands of no others except our presidents." *De Corona Militis*, Chap. 3.

(2) *Its relation to the Agape.* We have seen that the Communion of the apostolic age was a supper. It was at first observed in upper rooms, households, and halls, but soon as a periodic act of worship it became the central meeting of the assembly or church (ἐκκλησία), 1 Cor. 11:18. The celebration of the Communion in its relation to the Agape or Supper de-

[1] *The Didache*, or *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* was discovered in 1875 by Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, in the library of the Jerusalem monastery in Phanar, the Greek quarter of Constantinople, in a manuscript of the eleventh century (1056 A. D.), written by "the hand of Leo notary and sinner."

It is believed by most critics that it was written in a Christian Jewish community between A. D. 80 and 100; though some think that its date may be forty years later.

veloped the social character and spiritual life of the Church.

(a) The Social fellowship. We have seen that "Breaking of Bread" was the first name of the Communion, and this very fittingly reflected the social spirit which was so essential to the life of the bereaved disciples. How often it is repeated that they were together in one place (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό),[1] and the crowning act of their assembling was the Lord's Supper, including Agape and eucharist, of which all members partook in common as a token of brotherhood. As the eating together afforded opportunity in a social way to endear friendship it naturally was called ('Αγάπη) or love. Every Agape may not have been an eucharist (Acts 6: 1), but the *Didache*, at the time of its composition, indicates that the two rites were united after the example of the Last Supper, for it says, "And after ye are filled give thanks thus," &c. (Chap. 10).

It is worthy of note that the agape, with frequency of celebration, at first served to display charity for those in need. The deacons received contributions of food, ampullæ or jars of wine, and money at the meetings, which made the next agape possible and these material things were called "collection" (λογίας), 1 Cor. 16: 1.

When the eucharist eventually separated itself from the agape (we do not know the exact date of the dissociation), it took over this usage of receiving the gifts of the faithful, and a remnant of the custom is still preserved in the offertory. In that age of unorganized relief, almsgiving and charity were a special

[1] Acts 2: 1; 2: 44; 12: 12.

virtue. It is worthy of note that the Church was a leader in charity when there was no organized relief, and when charity became better organized, with larger program and more scientific methods the Church still kept in the lead.

Gentile converts, when their old beliefs were not abandoned, debased the eucharist towards the level of their own licentious feasts. Before the Agapæ were suppressed the Supper was converted into worldly dissipation, in which the symbolical meaning and spiritual character were lost and displaced by sensuous pleasures and unrestrained excesses of a degrading nature. Thus, by the middle of the second century, in some instances, the resemblance between the eucharist and the pagan mysteries was so great that Justin Martyr made the unwarranted charge that the heathen Mithraic mysteries had been borrowed from the usages of the Christian eucharist (*Apolog.* i. 66).

(b) Spiritual life and worship. The social side of the Supper is recorded in its early names, "Breaking of Bread," "Communion," and "Agape"; but these soon were superseded by the spirit which dominated the disciples when they came together, which was the spirit of prayer, which expressed itself in the "blessing," or "thanksgiving" (εὐχαριστία).

The term Eucharist for the Lord's Supper is first found in Ignatius (*Ad Philadelph.* c. 4). As the Breaking of Bread constituted an act of worship, the prayer, or "thanksgiving" for the elements displaced the earlier names, and *Eucharist* became the prevailing name of the Supper. Justin says:

"For we do not take these as ordinary bread and ordinary drink, but as by word of God Jesus Christ our Savior became incarnate,

and had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also the food made Eucharist by prayer of word from Him." (*Apolog.* 66.)

But to Justin the Supper is not a material sacrifice, but to him the words of institution and the accompanying words of praise and thanksgiving represent the "spiritual sacrifices,"[1] and these eventually were expanded into the eucharistic prayer of the later Liturgies.

(3) *How Celebrated.* There are a number of important inquiries connected with the early observance of the Lord's Supper. The sub-apostolic age is almost a blank so far as any knowledge of liturgical usage is concerned. Justin gives the first fixed but fragmentary ideas of the celebration, but we would infer that "each local church used the greatest freedom in the management of its own affairs and liturgy."[2]

(a) The celebrant, or presiding officer. In the New Testament the Breaking of Bread is a congregational service, without any intimation that it was under the supervision of any ecclesiastical functionary. The primitive Supper was a meal, and when the disciples were "breaking bread at home" there was nothing inconsistent for any devout Christian to offer thanks, or say the "grace."[3] But in the course of time, elders

---

[1] "That indeed both prayers and thanksgivings, made by the worthy, are alone perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God, I also say." *Trypho*, 117.

[2] R. H. Wooley, B.D., *The Liturgy of the Primitive Church*, p. 46, Cambridge, 1910.

[3] The priesthood of believers was taught by the early church; Irenæus said: "All just men possess the order of the priesthood." (*Contra Haeres.*, Lib. IV, Cap. 8). And Tertullian, referring to Rev. 1:6 asked: "And are not we laity priests?" (*Lib. de Exhortatione Castitatis*, Cap. vii, P. L. tom. ii, Col. 922).

assisted by deacons became the customary presiding officers. During the first century presbyter and bishop seemed to be used indifferently for the same office. The *Didache* knows nothing about presbyters (Chap. 15), and the "bishops and deacons" were simply "appointed" (χειροτονήσατε). The church polity of the second century gradually recognized the authority of the bishop, though he was at first only a senior elder of a local congregation, without any clerical supremacy or parochial see.[1] But presbyters at the end of the first century are especially allowed by St. Clement of Rome to celebrate (*ad. Cor.* 1. 44) and definitely in the *Didache* (c. x.) and the *Testament of our Lord* (c. 31, p. 95), "Let the presbyter praise and give thanks in the same way as the bishop." By the time of Ignatius the sacerdotal spirit had created the bishop's office to appear for the first time under the name by which it has since been known in history.[2] He had become the head of his local church and without his consent no service was valid.[3] Still Justin im-

[1] At first the presbyters and bishops were the same (Acts 20: 17, 28). They were called elders (πρεσβυτέροι) on account of their age or experience, and bishops (ἐπισκόποι) on account of their office, to oversee or superintend.

[2] J. H. Srawley, D.D., *The Epistles of Ignatius*, p. 34, London, 1919.

[3] "Let no man do aught pertaining to the church apart from the bishop. Let that eucharist be considered valid which is under the bishop, or him to whom he commits it. Wheresoever the bishop appears, there let the people be, even as wheresoever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church. (This is the earliest occurrence of the term Catholic Church (ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία) in Christian literature, and means Church *universal* as contrasted with the local church at Smyrna). It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize, or to hold a love-feast. But whatsoever he approves, that also is well pleasing to God, that everything which you do may be secure and valid." J. H. Srawley, D.D., *Smyrna* 8. 1, 2.

plies that the celebration was not subject to clerical restrictions, and in the main was not liturgical, for he calls the celebrant "the president of the brothers," and says:

"On the day of the Sun (Sunday) all who live in towns or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. Then when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of the good examples cited. Then all rise together, and prayers are offered. At length, as we have already described, prayer being ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers prayer and thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the people assent by saying *Amen:* and the distribution is made to each one of his share of the elements which have been blessed, and to those who are not present it is sent by the ministry of the deacons." *Apology* I, 67.

In Clement of Rome the church officers are to the sanctuary by analogy what the Jewish priests were to the tabernacle and temple.

(b) The elements. Bread and wine by their function and character are appropriate symbols and accessible to all nations. And it is surprising that their history should have given rise to so much controversy. Jesus "took bread," and "when he had blessed" and said, "This is my body," as He held it in His hand, it was still bread; for how could it be changed into His real body (in either "substance," or "appearance," Thomas Aquinas), without duplicating Himself into another body, a doctrine which staggers our belief.[1] And as for the Sacrament, no one would expect its consecration to be more, nor wish it to be less, than that of

[1] In examination of the doctrine of the "Real presence," as advocated by E. B. Pusey and the Tractarian Movement, see Thomas S. L. Bogan, D.D., *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, London, 1871. That book was never answered.

the Last Supper. But was not that consecration for the "bread" a "blessing," or "thanksgiving," the same as that offered for the "cup," of which it is said: "They all drank of it" (Mark 14: 23)? And please note that "all" (πάντες) is specifically said only of the cup, as an anticipated eternal protest against withdrawing it from the laity. In the Supper of the sub-apostolic age there is frequent reference to the broken bread and the mixed cup.[1] Harnack asserted that in some regions or localities the Supper was observed with water instead of wine; but that this was the usual custom seems to have been successfully refuted by Zahn and others.

The *Didache* places the cup before the bread, but this is at variance with Justin and Ignatius, and all Church Orders; so that the viewpoint is gaining ground that the *Didache* is individualistic, and not the communion order of any church.[2] It should be

[1] The mixed cup is mentioned by the following: *Irenæus* IV, xxxiii, 2; V, ii, 2; *Epitaph of Avircius; Didache*, Cap. X; and Justin *Apolog.* I. 65. That this was the usual custom seems to have been successfully refuted by John and others.

[2] *Didache*, Chap. ix. "Now concerning the Eucharist, thus give thanks; first, for the cup: 'We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be the glory forever.' And for the broken bread: 'We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and the knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory forever. As this broken bread was once scattered upon the mountains, and being gathered became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever.' But let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist, but those baptized into the Lord's name; for of this the Lord hath said: 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs.'"

Chap. x. "Now after ye are filled (at the meal) give thanks thus: 'We thank Thee, Holy Father, for Thy holy Name, which Thou hast

observed that the *Didache* does not include the words of institution, and makes no reference to the Last Supper, nor to the death of Jesus; but, on the other hand, the prayers are thoroughly Jewish.

(c) The Service. The second century is almost a blank as far as our knowledge of the liturgy is con-

---

made to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge, faith, and immortality made known to us through Jesus Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory forever. Thou, Almighty Lord, didst create all things for Thy Name's sake, Thou didst bestow food and drink upon men to enjoy, that they might give Thee thanks, and to us Thou didst grant spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy Servant. Above all things we give Thee thanks that Thou art mighty; to Thee be the glory for ever. Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to save it from all evil, and to perfect it in Thy love; and gather it from the four winds, sanctified into Thy kingdom, which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory for ever. Let grace come, and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any be holy let him come; if any be not, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen. But permit the prophets to give thanks as much as they will.'"

Chap. xiv. "But on the Lord's Day assemble and break bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure. Every one who is at variance with his neighbor, let him not join your company, until they be reconciled. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: 'In every place and time offer me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and My Name is wonderful among the nations.'"

It is believed by some students of the *Didache* that the prayers of chapters ix and x are blessings specifically, for the Agape, for the injunction, "after ye are filled," presupposes a meal. But the term εὐχαριστία and reference to "spiritual food and drink," make others think that we have here primitive formulæ parallel with the Gnostic prayers found in the *Acts of John* which are undoubtedly eucharistic (J. H. Srawley, D.D., *The Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 25f. Cambridge, 1913).

It is possible that chapters ix and x were instructions for communicants at their ordinary gatherings, while chapter xiv only contemplated the public breaking of bread. For the instruction, "If any be holy, let him come," implies a transition from the social Agape to the more restricted Eucharistic Service, and anticipates the *sancta*

cerned, for apparently there was none. Justin gives the first definite account of some rudimentary practice interspersed with extemporaneous freedom. The service consisted, among other things, of preliminary praise (psalms, responses, prayers), lessons from the Old Testament or the Gospels, homily (according to Justin), and thanksgiving for the elements. We gather from Paul that the primitive church was accustomed to self-edification,[1] for he says, "What is it then, breth-

---

sanctis of the Liturgies, which later displaced the extempore prayers of "the prophets."

Epitaph of Avircius. (Like the *Didache* it gives the cup before the bread.) "The citizen of an elect City, I made this in my lifetime, so as plainly to have there a resting-place for my body. My name is Avircius, the disciple of a pure Shepherd who tends flocks of sheep on hills and plains, and who has eyes great and all-seeing. He taught me words and trustworthy letters, and sent me to Rome to behold a King and to see a Queen in golden raiment, in golden shoes; and I saw there a People having a bright Seal. Also I saw Syria's plain, and all its towns, and Nisibis when I crossed Euphrates; and everywhere I had comrades. With Paul I followed, and faith everywhere led the way, and everywhere set Food before me, Fish from fountain, mighty, pure, which a chaste Virgin laid hold of, and this bestowed on friends to eat continually, with excellent Wine, giving mingled Wine with Bread."

[1] "A great feature of the worship described in the Church Orders is the audible part taken by the congregation. Not only do they say the Amen, a custom alluded to by St. Paul (1 Cor. 14: 16), but they audibly join in part of the service. In the *Testament of Our Lord* they say after the bishop the part called The Oblation or Aramnesis at the Eucharist, and they make responses very much as we do; in the *Pilgrimage of Selvia* the boys cry "Lord, have mercy" in the Litany; and so with other authorities. The priesthood of the laity is emphasized in early as in late liturgical formularies, for the people show by their audible responses that the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is theirs as well as the officiants." A. J. MacLean, *Recent Discoveries Illustrated*, p. 101, London, 1904. From the first it was antiphonal. The congregation too took part in singing. It is probable that a great part of the service was sung. The Church Orders indicate that there

ren, when ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying."[1]

There were responses in "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs," and the use of the "Amen" after prayer (1 Cor. 14: 16), which at a later date, when the Liturgy was introduced, found a place at the end of the Prayer of Consecration. This practice doubtless had descended from the Synagogue worship, for Pliny's *Letter* reported that they had responses in the service, for they sang antiphonally. In the passover ritual it was customary to recite God's wondrous dealings with Israel; in like manner in the Lord's Supper invariably there were responses and a homily as an exhortation based on the Scripture read. The "Grace" was purely a thanksgiving for the elements, for the Church claimed no secret tradition as to any form of consecration. Therefore, there seems to be no good reason why prescribed prayers of liturgies which were not in existence until the third and fourth centuries should be held indispensable to a valid sacrament.

(d) The distribution. After benedictions,[2] lections, and prayers, the kiss of peace, the usual oriental greeting was exchanged (which now has become obsolete in all usages), and when thanksgiving was made the bread, after fraction, was given to the deacons and carried around for distribution.

---

were choirs, and singing was organized, but until the last quarter of the fourth century, the singers were not a separate ecclesiastical order.

[1] 1 Cor. 14: 26.

[2] Epiclesis was first mentioned technically by St. Basil.

The people received the sacrament in both kinds, in their hands, and said Amen after each reception, and in some churches thanksgiving after reception ended the service. The "kiss of peace" was known to St. Paul as an oriental token of fellowship not peculiar to the Communion. In the *Acts of St. Perpetua* we are told how the martyrs first kissed each other that they might complete their martyrdom with the solemnity of the kiss (Cap. xxi). And with the earliest introduction of the liturgy, the kiss of peace was exchanged by the clergy at the very beginning of the eucharistic service. It was mentioned by Justin (*Apolog.* I. 65), and Origen refers to the "kiss which we give each other in the Church at the time of the mysteries" (*Comm. on the Song of Solomon*, Lib. i. tom. iii, p. 37).

(4) Doctrinal Changes and Tendencies. The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper has been set forth at length in the *Communion Addresses*, so to avoid repetition we do not again outline its (1) Memorial character, (2) Sacramental meaning, and (3) Means of Grace as a Communion.

It is needful to say, in the first place, that the Lord's Supper is not in the strict meaning of the word *a sacrifice*. The New Testament sets forth the death of Jesus Christ historically as an expiation for sin, but does not differentiate any communion doctrine. In the age of the apostles all ideas of worship were expressed in sacrificial terminology, but in Christian usage this was wholly figurative (Rom. 12:1). But it is fair to concede that soon after the apostolic age the adoption of the Jewish sacrificial terminology caused it to become customary to look upon the elements as a sacrifice to God. Then to offset Gnostic

speculation, which asserted that Christ never had a physical body, it became customary to point to the elements as his body, and to assert that he was physically present in them. Through a sacrificial nomenclature the elements first were spiritual sacrifices, then in time a grosser sense attached to them. For to the heathen to partake of the meat sacrificed to idols was to share with the deity invisibly present. This same conception was applied to the Lord's Supper, for Christ's presence in the eucharist was thought to depend on the words of institution, "This is my body," etc., pronounced by the priest in the consecration of the elements. Hand in hand with this sacerdotal conception, from its germ to its culmination, we find important transformations[1] reflected in the Supper, through its administrator, consecration, liturgy, and doctrine recapitulated in the following brief survey:

First, The sacerdotal spirit turned the celebrant into a sacrificing priest, and made lay communion impossible. Second, The doctrine of sacrificial consecration substituted the literal for the symbolic, and eventually materialized the Real Presence in the Mass. Third, The elaborated service of the rich metropolitan churches became the fixed liturgy of their respective

[1] "In the course of the second century the organization of congregations was thoroughly altered; the foundations of the government of the Catholic Church were formed. The alterations were shown principally by three developments: 1st, The prophets and teachers died out more and more or were deprived of their original significance. 2nd, The worship and other relations made it necessary to place *one* man at the head of the administration of the congregation—the ἐπίσκοποι were fused into the bishop. 3rd, The directing college of elders was more and more degraded to the position of an advising college for the support of the bishop." A. Harnack, *Sources of the Apostolic Canons*, p. 81, London, 1895.

communities. Fourth, The Communion, through theological controversy, has been fenced, and made a test of fellowship and seal of absolution.

1. The sacerdotal idea applied to the Lord's Supper. At the close of the first century, when the last apostle was easily remembered, Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Church at Corinth,[1] under the guise of an appeal for better order, was the first to voice the priestly spirit and prepare the way for the episcopate. He enjoins that the ministry should receive reverence according to their order, and represents the bishops as the successors of the apostles.

With Ignatius, the second bishop of Antioch, who sealed his ministry with martyrdom, 107 A. D., we find unmistakable trend towards episcopacy and a recognition of the pre-eminence of the church of Rome. For him the bishop represents the complete power of the church, and his presence is indispensable to the service of the altar.[2] Instead of the college of elders (Acts 20: 17, 28), by a new ecclesiastical polity, he alone receives the oversight for a lifetime, and becomes the custodian of orthodoxy, and one to be "looked upon even as we would upon the Lord himself" (Ignatius

[1] Clement does not assume to write as "the bishop of Rome," but writes to the Corinthians in the name of "the church at Rome." His letter has the admonitory tone and superiority of the church of imperial Rome over that of a vanquished city, and reminds the lawless and disorderly church "we ought to do everything in order." *Epist. to Cor.* S, 40.

[2] "It is impossible apart from the bishop either to baptize or to make a love-feast; but whatever he approves, that is acceptable also to God." *Smyrn.* 8. 2.

But so far as ordination (and apostolic succession) is concerned, he was consecrated the chief *minister* of a congregation, and not a diocesan bishop.

Ad Eph. ii). But all the fathers did not deflect from apostolic simplicity at the same time. Justin Martyr was less bold than Ignatius, and represents the celebration of the Supper by a president over an assembly, with deacons to distribute the elements.

Irenæus (130–200 A. D.) was slightly more ritual than Justin, for he makes the bishop the depository of apostolic tradition. He employs the word priest (ἱέρος, *sacerdos*, which was the term for a sacrificing priest in the New Testament), but, strictly speaking, there was no sacrificing priesthood such as we find in Cyprian until after Irenæus.

It was Cyprian (died as a martyr 258 A. D.) who first gathered into a complete and powerful system the elements of episcopal authority, so as to represent the bishop as the vicar of Christ in spiritual matters, and whose sentence is final. He places the bishops, priests, and deacons on a level with the Jewish high-priests, priests, and Levites of the Old Testament, and represents the bishop as a sacrificing priest to celebrate daily communion—officiating in Christ's place and imitating what He did, as He "offers in the church a true and full sacrifice to God the Father." Thus he attributes to the Supper the propitiatory power of a renewed sacrifice, and clothes it with judgments and terrors, and miraculous incidents for those guilty of shortcomings.

With the organization of the ministry the priests isolated themselves more and more from the members, and this exclusiveness, coupled with self-imposed penances, promoted ascetic and monastic tendencies, which regarded physical austerity and celibacy necessary to the attainment of extreme consecration.

2. The Propitiatory Idea in the Lord's Supper. In the Gospels the Supper is a memorial Communion, but in the second century it has become figuratively the seal of absolution, for Ignatius calls it "the medicine of immortality, an antidote that we may not die," which evidently implies immunity against the penalty of sin. It is safe to say that the doctrine of the Real Presence is of sub-apostolic origin and finds no support in the New Testament. It is true that in the ritualistic controversy, "This do (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε) for a memorial of me," has been rendered, "Offer this sacrifice for a memorial of me." But, though ποιεῖν is rendered *sacrifice* in the LXX,[1] critical scholars, even high churchmen, reject that view of this passage. In concluding his investigation of that interpretation Bishop Gore says, "There is not sufficient evidence to entitle us to say that ποιεῖν bears the sacrificial sense in the New Testament."[2]

But as early as the *Didache* sacrificial terms (θυσία and προσφέρειν) spiritually were applied to the Communion bread and wine; but they were not viewed as a piacular sacrifice until the sacerdotal spirit transformed the thanksgiving into a sacramental consecration. Bishop Wordsworth says, "the words 'sanctification' or 'consecration' are, I think, hardly found in the first two centuries as descriptive of the Eucharistic action." But in course of time the Old Testament sanctified and sacrificial idea of consecration took the place of the blessing or thanksgiving of the Lord's Supper, and with the adoption of sacrificial

---

[1] Exod. 29: 38f.; Lev. 9: 7; 1 Kings 11: 33.

[2] Charles Gore, M.A., D.D., *The Body of Christ*, p. 318, London, 1901.

terminology, the Table became an altar and the elements the host.

And since the bread by the priest's consecration became the real body of our Lord, great peril was felt lest a particle should fall to the ground, and thereby subject the recipient "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." After the doctrine of consecration converted the Supper into a sacrifice, and incorporated the elements into the real presence, it became customary to practice "reservation," and "adoration" of the elements, and the questions were raised, How should the remnants of the consecrated bread and wine not consumed be disposed of, and at what time and with what directing care should the vessels be washed.[1] The high churchmen are insistent on traditional authority for leaving the consecrated remains on the altar until the next day, thus implying that the altar should never be without its sacrifice. Tertullian alludes to the Lord's table as "God's altar" and to communicating as "partaking of the sacrifice"; but in his more thoughtful moments concedes that the bread was not actually changed, but was simply the "figure" of the body of Christ. Origen employs much allegory, and cautions those "present at the divine mysteries," "lest any of the consecrated gift slip," and alludes to the Supper as "the bloodless sacrifice," and "new mysteries." But Cyprian is much more extreme than his predecessors in his veneration for the consecrated elements. He materializes the Supper

[1] Even in the twentieth century books are written pleading the traditional mediæval treatment of the consecrated remains. W. Lockton, *The Treatment of the Remains at the Eucharist after Holy Communion, and the Time of the Ablutions*, Cambridge, 1920.

nearly to the point of idolatry, and surrounds it with superstitious legends and terrible judgments. The miraculous efficacy and saving power of the elements were so greatly advanced that eucharist for the dead was offered first in Cyprian's church in North Africa. These unwarranted ideas of consecration paved the way for bolder innovations, such as the confessional, absolution, the viaticum, and adoration of the host.

3. The Development and Authority of the Liturgy. The word Liturgy (λειτουργία) in the Scriptures was used to designate worship, without any reference to its matter or form; but before the end of the fourth century it acquired a technical meaning, and stood for the prescribed form of church service.

Though we have intimated that the Liturgies possess no binding authority, it is the privilege of any church to use a liturgy. We are investigating the history of worship and desire to say nothing derogatory of the Liturgies themselves. For we are mindful that they were prepared by devout men, and notwithstanding their faulty doctrine of the Supper, they foster devotion. The prayers of the early Church may engender a spirit that will give expression and wings to our own prayers. But the Church is a growing institution and though proud of its history, its new problems and growing life require new prayers and suggest new thanksgivings at communion. But as possessing any binding power over the Church we are aware that the Church orders are apocryphal. The "Twelve Apostles" never formulated the "teaching of the Didache," and the "Testament of our Lord" and Apostolic church orders were productions of the fourth century, and "probably originated in Rome."

However, it is agreed by scholars that the words and form of the "Blessing" or "Thanksgiving" used by our Lord over the Bread and Cup in the Last Supper were wholly lost before the New Testament was written, and the Church never seemed to have laid any stress on them. The most ardent ritualists acknowledge the evidences of the existence of oral prayers in the second century, and offer no proof of written liturgies[1] earlier than 325 A. D. And it has been observed that in the persecutions of Christians there are no accounts of liturgies being destroyed. Furthermore, what the ritualists regard as the prominent parts of the consecration (1, Thanksgiving; 2, Invocation; 3, Recital of the Institution; 4, The Lord's Prayer; 5, Prayer of Consecration) hold no uniform place in the different Liturgies. Doubtless, the spirit and perhaps some of the words of the early prayers of the Church descended from one service to the other in the Communion thanksgivings. The earliest remains of such vibrations is the "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts, all creation is full of his glory," of Clement of Rome, which became the Trisagion of all Liturgies. We believe that the Liturgies arose without a definite plan. The plain communions of *the household ecclesia were elaborated by the devices of metropolitan bishops*,[2] to enrich their respective services, and their progressive ideas reacted on other churches of their community. These innovations traveled from the great centres, such as Jerusalem, Alexandria,

[1] Rev. Fernand Cabrol, O.S.B., *Liturgical Prayer, Its History and Spirit*, London, 1922.

[2] Joseph Bingham, M.A., *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, Vol. lv., p. 186, London, 1844.

Antioch, and Rome, and were adopted by the adjacent churches.

During the first century the Lord's Supper was the only service which called out the whole church. The preparatory part of that service included hymns, chants, and prayers, bursting spontaneously from inspired hearts, and the lessons from the law and prophets after the example of the synagogue, called into existence the *ambones*, those magnificent reading desks of the early Roman Church.

As the Lord's Supper was to "proclaim the Lord's death till he come" we would infer that the apostolic communion was public throughout, but in the second century it seems to be open only to the close of the homily. The exaggerated sanctity attached to consecration made it necessary to exclude unbelievers and young people, and for them an open service, called *Missa Catechumenorum*, was instituted, consisting of psalms, hymns, lessons from the Old and New Testament (after it was written), homily, and prayer. When this was dismissed "the faithful" remained, and the Communion proper, called "*Missa fidelium*," followed with prayers and thanksgiving for the elements and reception in both kinds. It was not until the third century that each communicant received singly from the hand of the administrator, and a little later were not allowed to touch the elements.

Accompanying the sacrosanct consecration and increased reverence for the elements, piacular efficacy attached to them and daily or frequent celebrations became customary, and then the liturgy was lengthened and elaborated, additional priests with imposing vestments appeared in magnificent processions, and

choral music with repeated doxology, etc.,[1] and altar illumination heightened the pictorial effect. With the increased wealth of the church the taste in external appointments became more luxurious, and then the growing ritualistic sentiment made the altar with its frequent propitiary Mass displace and nullify the pulpit and its message.

4. The Reaction of Theological Speculation upon the Communion. In the apostolic age the Communion was free from theology, and the Church at Jerusalem, Rome and everywhere was one in faith. But in the course of time the sacraments became the battlefield of theology, and almost every ecclesiastical controversy had its ordnance tried here. Doctrinal development coined new vocabulary, and the terms which were at first fluid in time became technical and rigid. Tertullian with the genius of a Roman jurist introduced the words "sacramentum" and "sanctum" and clothed the sacramental doctrine in Latin dress. Though the *sacramentum*, according to Tertullian, invariably signifies *mystery*, and not the vow of military and legal usage, Augustine employs it in its classical meaning, for he speaks of the "sacrament as the greatest vow we have vowed."

The memorial character of the Supper was obscured, and dogma and dialectics dominated the Church to the extent that exaggerated notions of consecration had no correction. The belief that the elements were changed by consecration constituted them the seal of

[1] It is probable that a great part of the service was sung. The Church Orders indicate that there were choirs, and singing was organized, but the singers were not a separate ecclesiastical order until the last quarter of the fourth century.

forgiveness, so that it became customary to administer them to the dying and to infants.

Owing to the controversies concerning the nature of the sacraments and the purification necessary for communion, it became customary for the mediæval prelates to pass on the orthodoxy and fitness of communicants, and thus communion was made a test of fellowship. Those who had relapsed, or were thought to be heretical, were denied communion or were "excommunicated."

Though we find no evidence of the adoration of the elements in Ante-Nicene literature, it was not long until as the symbols of expiation they became the objects of veneration, and contemporaneously the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice gravitated steadily towards its final development in transubstantiation, which was pronounced by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215 A. D.).

MODERN CRITICISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER

A track previously unknown was recently discovered at Stonehenge from an aeroplane. Similarly a bird's-eye view of eucharistic criticism from a height of thirty years' observation may possibly discover, besides abandoned tracks and eroded landmarks, some historic avenues which may be retraced to become highways of better thought, leading to that which is permanent in the Lord's Supper, as a shrine of the Master's own creation.

The ordinary Christian who has been accustomed to find the origin of the Eucharist in the Last Supper, and its repetition in the injunction, "This do in re-

membrance of me," may feel shocked at the assaults which deny its historicity, and the speculative theories which eliminate the institutional and sacramental from the Supper.[1] Notwithstanding all this, we should not disapprove of biblical criticism, for where the data are uncertain between two or more possible explanations, the skepticism of the critical mind must scrutinize the truth in the interest of true faith. For the historical fact may be one thing, but the report of it a very different color.

The criticisms of the Lord's Supper have been exceedingly voluminous and complex, and it is entirely beyond our space and resources to attempt even a synopsis. But, though this book is published primarily as an aid to a more effective use of the Communion, and though many radical theories advanced are already obsolete, and still more regarded evanescent and immaterial, in the interest of a wider knowledge of the Lord's Supper it is deemed advisable to give a brief summary of eucharistic criticism.

Modern biblical criticism began in the latter years of the nineteenth century, and whether the assault on Christianity was directed towards the (1) person of Christ, (2) the credibility of the Gospels, or (3) the organization of the Church, it all had a bearing indirectly on the origin and doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

With the incoming sway of evolution in education

[1] A recent book on the subject shows that the divine origin of the Lord's Supper is widely disputed; and as a sample of this theology gives this quotation from Mr. H. G. Wood: "The narratives in St. Matthew and St. Mark do not suggest that Jesus expressly desired the repetition of the scene in the Upper Room. It is doubtful if we ought to say that he ordained the Sacrament." Douglas S. Guy, B.D., *Was Holy Communion Instituted by Jesus?* p. 22, 1924.

there has been a growing tendency to divest biblical interpretation of the supernatural, and to seek the origin and development of Christian sacraments in comparative religion and the inborn worshipping nature of humanity. But if the spirit of criticism were anything but serious it might find some surprise that so many fierce attacks and so much well-prepared ammunition have yielded nothing but shifting strategy. Where do the manœuvres of criticism to-day predict that we are to find the origin of the Lord's Supper, in Jesus or in the disciples?

I. *Jesus Christ in his relation to Christianity and its institutions.*

(1) Looking back from the twentieth century upon Jesus as He lived in Palestine, modern criticism finds grounds for different interpretations of Him, as found on the one hand, in the fragmentary biographies of the Gospels, and on the other, in the exalted preaching of the apostles. The meagre reports of the New Testament, and differences of omissions and variations in Gospel manuscripts, make it possible for rigid critics to draw a picture of the author of Christianity very much at variance with the traditional teachings of the apostles and testimony of the early Church. While still to more conservative scholars the Jesus of the Gospels, the companion of the apostles, and risen Lord of the undivided Church, remains the Christ of faith and of Christian experience.

Besides, there is also a radical or hostile criticism which rejects traditional faith,[1] and goes the length

[1] The radical critic, like a wolf, attacks what to him is vulnerable, and gives no thought as to how that which survives the mutilation appears or functions.

of denying, not only that Jesus did not institute the Supper, but that He Himself never lived. D. F. Strauss, in his *Life of Jesus*,[1] was the first of modern critics to cast doubt on accepted Christian traditions by assuming a skeptical attitude towards the statements of the Gospels, and giving a fictitious interpretation to the miracles of Christ. Strauss attacked the Church's belief, and without presenting any definite view of his own, suggested this or that interpretation (always derogatory to Christ), which prepared the way for Bruno Bauer to dispute the credibility of the New Testament and finally to reject the evidence for Jesus' existence. Bauer affirmed that Jesus was not Christianity's founder, but only its fictitious product. The criticisms of Bauer passed almost unnoticed, but in course of time doubt about Jesus' existence was advanced as a skeptical propaganda, in America by W. B. Smith, in England by J. M. Robertson, and in France by Salomon Reinach, and in Germany by A. Kalthoff, Jensen, Drews, and others.[2] This hostile assault on the existence of Jesus culminated in the publication of Arthur Drews, *The Christ Myth*, 1910,[3] which by explaining the incarnation, Lord's Supper, resurrection, etc., by analogous legends of heathen mythology and discrediting New Testament history and all extra-canonical evidence, made out that there is no proof for Jesus' earthly existence. Much stress

---

[1] *Das Leben Jesu*, Tübingen, 1835 and 1836.

[2] Salomon Reinach, *Cultes, Mythes et religions*, Paris, 1905–1908. A. Kalthoff, *Das Christusproblem, Grundlinien zu einer Sozialtheologie*, Leipzig, 1903. P. Jensen, *Das Gilgemesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur*, etc., Strassburg, 1906.

[3] *Christusmythe*, 1909.

was laid upon the paucity of the non-Christian references to Christ, and the historical events connected with the life of our Lord were offset by miraculous legends concerning gods and heroes. In advancing the propaganda it was maintained that ideas and not persons are the dominating factors in the origin of religion, and on this principle the genesis of Christianity is found in a Christ-idea, and not in a historical Jesus.

Strauss and his disciples have been successfully answered long ago, and Drews was repeatedly controverted in several university centers by various New Testament scholars of the first rank. A very satisfactory account of these controversies and kindred radical criticism is found in Shirley Jackson Case, *The Historicity of Jesus*, University of Chicago Press, 1912. Dr. Case gives, not only the literature to the criticisms, but a re-examination of the arguments and his own conclusions.[1]

(2) Independently of any personal origin, and without any attempt at exegesis, some writers find a key to the Sacraments in the primitive "gnosis," or secret cults and esoteric mysteries of the ancient world, and on the basis of analogy, without historic proof, propose to interpret the Eucharist by the same law of sacramental origin as the totem-sacrifices of Mexico and Africa.[2]

But the totem-worshipper and the devotee of ethnic rites possessed no authentic origin, or intelligent meaning to his ceremonies, which is a marked contrast to

[1] For a fuller summary of speculative theories, see M. Goguel, *L'Eucharistie*, Paris, 1910.

[2] W. R. Inge, M.A., *Contenio Veritatis*, p. 272, New York, 1902.

the position of the believer in the divine origin and purpose of the Lord's Supper.

(3) The real modern criticism of the Supper was opened about 1891 by A. Harnack,[1] when he asserted that in the Church of the second century the eucharistic cup was filled with wine and water, or with water only with comparative indifference; not only in Ephesus and Rome, but also in the whole church of North Africa (Cyprian *Epist.* lxiii, *ad Caesilius*).

Harnack laid stress that in the rite instituted by Jesus the benediction was attached originally to the act of eating and drinking, and not to the bread and wine. He notes that this conception forbids any analogy between the Christian Communion and pagan mysteries, for in the Communion the act of importance is the eating and drinking, while in the mysteries the element absorbed was the vital point.

He was answered within a year by Zahn[2] and Jülicher.[3] Zahn controverted his conclusions sharply, and put the weight of argument rather in favor of wine by his thesis, "*Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper of the Old Church.*" Jülicher approved the explanation that Justin's object in mentioning water was simply to refute the calumnies current concerning the orgies supposed to attend the Christian celebration. Zahn maintained that the use of water in the Lord's Supper, among ascetic sects is no proof that wine was used only in a limited way in North Africa. The practice may have originated with morning com-

[1] Brod und Wasser, *Texte und Unterzuchungen*, vii Band, Heft 2, 1891.

[2] T. Zahn, *Brod und Wein im Abendmahl der Alten Kirche*, 1892.

[3] A. Jülicher, *Zur Geschichte der Abendmahlfeier in der altesten Kirche*, 1892.

munion, because the use of wine in the morning was an offence against the laws of good society, as noted by Clement of Alexandria and Novatian.

Jülicher looked upon the Supper as a parable of Jesus to His disciples, to announce in a parting meal His approaching death. He did not request its repetition, but the associations of the Upper Room so profoundly impressed the disciples that afterwards whenever they met and ate together they recalled what Jesus had said and done. Thus while expecting His speedy return, the repetition of the Supper, in which Agape and Eucharist were one, arose spontaneously and lived on in the Church.

Spitta also made a minute study of the subject, and came to the conclusion that the Last Supper was celebrated on the 13th Nisan, and was not a Paschal Supper. By elaborate deductions from the Old Testament, apocalyptic literature, and Rabbinic writings he explains how Jewish teachers looked forward to a Messianic feast, in which the Messiah Himself was to be food for the subjects of the kingdom. His disciples kept the Passover a month later, and repeated the rite of the Last Supper, and thus unintentionally began the repetition of the Lord's Supper.[1]

W. Brandt likewise agreed that Jesus had no intention of establishing a Supper to be repeated in commemoration of His death, but suggests that it found its beginning in the transformation of the paschal celebration after 70 A. D., when the paschal lamb

---

[1] Friedrich Spitta, *Die urchristlichen Traditionen über Ursprung und Sinn Abendmahls, Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums*, I Gottingen, 1893, p. 205f.

ceased to be sacrificed, and the bread and wine were continued without it in a Christian passover.[1]

A. Schweitzer also gave extravagant support to the eschatalogical interpretation. He maintained that Jesus spoke to His disciples, not of His death in the ordinary sense, but of His death and speedy reunion with them in the feast of the kingdom. For he conceived that the action of Jesus in distributing the bread and wine was a consecration of the recipients to be partakers with Him of the Messianic feast.[2]

Axel Andersen adopted similar negative interpretation, and perhaps the most complete and systematic elimination of the sacramental conception from the primitive tradition; and looked upon the Last Supper simply as a farewell repast without any intimation of establishing an institution or a memorial.[3]

But while radical criticism invited increasing negations there was also new research and affirmation of some traditional positions. Pierre Battifol sought to conciliate the traditional faith of the Church with the data of history, and as a Catholic endeavored to uphold that the Mass, at least in its incipiency, was existent in the primitive Communion. He maintained that the "Breaking of Bread" referred only to the Eucharist, and that the Agape absolutely were non-existent in the Apostolic age, and that the testimony of St. Paul and the Synoptists supported by the

---

[1] *Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christenthums*, Leipzig, 1893.

[2] *Das Abendmahl in Zusammenhang mit dem Leben Jesu und der Gesch. des Urchrist.* I, II Tübingen, Leipzig, 1901.

[3] *Das Abendmahl in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christus.* Giessen, 1904.

faith of the universal Church verifies that the Eucharist was instituted by Jesus, and that it in its realism commemorates His death and the sacrifice of the cross, which he regards as the very idea of the Mass.[1]

Still, on the other hand, Jean Reville essayed to prove that "nothing in the course of the supper of that Thursday evening" indicated that the disciples had any consciousness that they were taking part in their Master's last repast; and from his viewpoint Jesus instituted nothing. But, owing to the near approach of the kingdom, the bread and cup from very early time became material symbols of the union between Christ and His disciples. From about the end of the first century the Church endeavored to regulate the Eucharistic celebration, which from that time assumed a cultural significance.[2]

Alfred Loisy occupied more compromising ground. For since the Synoptists report, that Jesus was celebrating His last supper, it must be that He had the impression that some dénouement was at hand, but He did not yet know what it was going to be. Perhaps the hoped-for kingdom, perhaps a terrible crisis, but He was conscious that this was the last time He would bless the bread and wine of the common meal.[3] But entirely different was the conception of the Communion which Paul attributes to a revelation from the Lord, in which the elements symbolize the union of the faithful with the crucified one.

The critical discussion in its wider bearings engaged

---

[1] *Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive, deuxième série, L'Eucharistie, la présence réelle et la transubstantiation*, Paris, 1905.

[2] *Les origines de l'eucharistie* (*Messe, Sainte-Cène*), Paris, 1908.

[3] *Les evangiles synoptiques*, Ceffonds, 1907–1908.

the attention of the world's Christian scholarship, and led to a more definite interpretation of the Lord's Supper as found in the New Testament.

II. *The application of Textual Criticism to the Lord's Supper.*

(1) An attempt was made to find an earlier origin for the Lord's Supper than Christ's last Passover. It has been observed that "if we had the Synoptics alone we should have gathered that Baptism was first instituted after the Resurrection; but we learn from John 4: 1 that it had been practiced by the twelve throughout our Lord's ministry."[1]

And it is asked, May not the Lord's Supper too have descended from the same date? For how otherwise could His discourse on the "bread of life" (John 6) be intelligible beforehand; and how could the two disciples at Emmaus (Luke 24: 13–33), who were not of His passover company, know Him in the breaking of bread?[2]

There is no intimation that the meal at Emmaus was a complete sacrament. Jesus had at various times taken bread and given thanks, and there may have been something special in His compliance or non-compliance with the accustomed meal blessing, which revealed His personality. Luke too may have recognized in the incident a re-enactment of the Last Supper; and as to His discourse about the "bread of life," it was not unusual for Jesus to use language which implied clear foresight of events and truths

[1] Arthur Wright, M.A., *New Testament Problems*, p. 141, London, 1898.

[2] Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.D., *The Expository Times*, p. 516, August, 1910.

not understood by the disciples until the germ unfolded.[1]

(2) The uncertainty as to whether the Last Supper was a true Passover celebration or not has given rise to many conjectures. The Synoptists describe the preparation, securing the guest-chamber, and the actual celebration of the Passover in the Upper Room, on Thursday evening of the Passion week (Mark 14: 12f.; Luke 22: 7, 15; and Matthew 26: 17f.); while the Fourth Gospel, with Rabbinical confirmation, asserts that the Jews were not to eat it until Friday evening, or the day of crucifixion (John 13: 29 and 18: 28). Of the various conjectures which attempt to avoid this apparent discrepancy, one of the most popular is that which assumes that the Last Supper was the Kiddush, or Sanctification of the day.[2] The Kiddush was a weekly domestic ceremony, a Sanctification of the Sabbath, and great festivals, in which a cup of wine and then some bread were solemnly blessed and distributed to the household before the evening meal. It has been observed that this view accounts for the cup preceding the bread, as it appears in the Western text of Luke 22: 17–19a; 1 Cor. 10: 16; and *Didache*.

But the transposition of the cup before the bread is contradicted by Mark and Paul's traditions, which are undisputed. And the Kiddush theory fails to explain why the Passover terminology has been applied to the Supper by Paul and patristic writers.

(3) But did Jesus keep a pre-Paschal celebration?

[1] Professor J. Henry Thayer, Recent Discussions Respecting the Lord's Supper. *Journ. of Biblical Literature*, xviii, p. 119, 1898.

[2] G. H. Box, *Journ. of Theolog. Studies*, iii, 357.

Three different interpretations have been given to "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (Luke 22: 15, 16):

(a) It has been usually understood that our Lord when sitting at the table expressed His great gratification at being able to eat that regular Passover with His disciples, and foreseeing His inevitable suffering, declared I will not eat it again.

(b) In the attempt to avoid a discrepancy between the Synoptics and Fourth Gospel as to the time of the Last Supper, it has been suggested that this was an anticipated Passover. "It is as if he had said, Because I cannot eat of the proper Passover, therefore have I desired before hand, in this form, to eat with you, and this very desire is now fulfilled" (Freeman's *Principles of Divine Service*, ii. 303).[1] Dr. J. C. Lambert (*The Sacraments of the New Testament*, p. 256, 1903) also has advocated the theory of an anticipated passover with ability.

(c) Professors F. C. Burkitt and A. E. Brooke have interpreted this declaration of Jesus to mean an unfulfilled desire, a note of regret and disappointment rather than a sign of gratification, as if He had said, "I have greatly longed to keep this Passover with you, but now I see that it will not be possible."[2] These writers hold that the betrayal brought about a change of purpose, an acknowledged defeat; and since they follow the Western text, they discover no request for a repe-

[1] Rev. G. F. Maclear, M.A., *The Witness of the Eucharist*, p. 119, London, 1864.

[2] *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. ix, pp. 569–572.

tition of the meal, nor any intimation of a sacramental meaning.

But this negative interpretation stands on questionable foundation and leaves much unexplained. Though the Aramaic "With desire I desired," like the English, may admit a negative construction, there is nothing determinative in the idiom. Therefore we should be slow to discredit the united testimony of the Synoptists.

But if we accept the view of Drs. Burkitt and Brooke that the meal of the Upper Room was not a Paschal supper, then what meaning did the rite have for our Lord Himself? If the Supper was not to be repeated, its predictions were strictly for the apostles alone. But in that case why was the shedding of His blood necessary? If the Aramaic idiom implied an avowal of disappointment, would there be any message to the twelve in the words, "This is my body," and what meaning could they attach to the phrase, "This is my blood of the covenant" (Mark 14:24)?

We think that a recent explanation of the discrepancy by Dr. George A. Barton is preferable. Those who contend that Jesus could not be arrested, tried, and executed on the great day of the feast, base their argument entirely on the testimony of the Fourth Gospel, which also states that the day of the crucifixion was the "Preparation of the Passover" (John 19:14, 31, 42). But Dr. Barton regards this untenable because:

1. It plainly contradicts the Synoptic Gospels.

2. The "Preparation" referred to was that of the Sabbath, and not of the Passover, Mark 15:42 and Luke 23:54.

3. The inference that the reverence of the Sanhedrin for the Passover would deter the arresting and crucifying of Jesus on that day is based on later Jewish custom reflected in the Talmud. But in this case the New Testament is a more reliable authority than the Talmud.

4. It is alleged also that the high priest at that time was a Sadducee, and was the president of the Sanhedrin, and interested in the profits of the Temple market, which Jesus had recently interrupted, therefore would not have the scruples of a Pharisee in accomplishing the removal of an enemy on a holy day. Therefore, since it is possible to account how the discrepancy concerning the day of crucifixion arose, and colored the text of the Fourth Gospel, which was not written until sixty or seventy years later, there is no ground for supposing that the Last Supper was not a Passover.

But is there any reason for thinking that John, and not the Synoptists, was mistaken about the day of crucifixion? Dr. Barton suggested that the discrepancy may have arisen in the two-fold manner of celebrating Easter. From the letter of Irenæus to Victor of Rome, preserved by Eusebius E. H. (xxiv), bearing on the Quartodeciman controversy, it has been shown that the discussion concerned, not only the keeping of a festival which celebrated Christ's resurrection, but also the keeping of the fast which preceded it.[1] The confusion about the date of that festival may have arisen through the worship of Jewish Christians, which in Jerusalem (Acts 2:46), and perhaps else-

[1] B. W. Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate.*

where, was not separated from the Temple and Synagogue services until the great war of 66–70. We learn from Irenæus that a part of the Quartodeciman controversy turned, not only on the time of the fast preceding the celebration of Christ's resurrection, but also on the date of the fast which was observed in memory of Christ's sufferings at his crucifixion. "In the time of Irenæus in those places where Easter was always celebrated on a Sunday, the fast was observed on the preceding Friday, but in Asia there was another practice which he declared went back to primitive time. Those who followed this fasted in memory of Christ's crucifixion on the 14th of Nisan, and some, as the author of the Fourth Gospel, believed in consequence that the crucifixion had actually occurred on the 14th." Dr. Barton writes the explanation is this:

"The primitive Church at Jerusalem consisted of orthodox Jews who were at the same time loyal Christians. As Christians they wished to fast in memory of the Master's sufferings; as Jews they wished to keep the Passover. It was, however, physically impossible to feast and fast at the same time. They accordingly anticipated the fast by a day, making it, perhaps, a part of the fast of Esther which other Jews were observing, so that as faithful Jews they could celebrate the Passover with others. The practice was followed by orthodox Jews in Ephesus, and in course of sixty or seventy years gave rise to the supposition that the crucifixion had taken place on Nisan the 14th. This simple and natural supposition explains all the facts without calling in question the veracity of our oldest sources, and is, I believe, the true explanation."

(4) Eschatalogical conceptions. The declaration of the Marcan-Matthæan account. "I will no longer drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God," is supposed by some to reflect the Jewish expectation of the coming

of the Messianic age, under the form of a banquet (Luke 22: 28–30). The two-fold nature of the kingdom and obscurity of some of the Master's predictions have occasioned some liberal scholars to view the Last Supper wholly in an eschatalogical sense. It is true that the "kingdom of God" was constantly on His lips, with its present and future aspects, its rewards to the faithful "now in this time," and "in the world to come eternal life" (Mark 10: 30). But while the apocalyptic is in the teaching of Jesus,[1] He connected His kingdom with no economic revolution and set no time for the end of the world (Mark 13: 32). And it is unfair to deplete His teaching of its spiritual meaning, and limit His words exclusively to the fulfillment of Old Testament Messianic predictions. The negative theories which we have reviewed are interwoven with eschatalogical conceptions, but fail to ascend to the spiritual atmosphere of the Last Supper. A liberal critic remarked lately that "recent scholarship has gone much further than is justifiable in the attempt to systematize Jewish thought on eschatology."[2] Owing to the spirit of the age it is possible that the preaching of the kingdom gave rise to expectations of His early return, which for the moment overlooked His ethical teaching, and forgot that from

---

[1] Jesus foretold desecration by the heathen (Mark 13: 14), and warned against false Messiahs (Mark 13: 21). These prophecies were fulfilled when in A. D. 70 Jerusalem fell into the hands of Titus after a siege of 143 days. Through the signs foretold it is said that the Christians, on the outbreak of the war, fled across the hill country to Pella, and escaped some of the terrible sufferings of the besieged. F. T. Foakes Jackson, D.D., *A Brief Biblical History*, p. 100, New York.

[2] Kirsopp Lake, D.D., *Landmarks in the Hist. of Early Christianity*, p. 17, New York, 1922.

the first He had taught that the Son of man must suffer and after three days rise again (Mark 8:31). "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life" (John 3:14, 15). In the teaching of Jesus and the interpretation of the apostles the kingdom in its fullness is evangelistic and universal (Matt. 8:11). Jesus Himself is a witness against the extreme eschatalogical expectations, for being asked by the Pharisees "when the kingdom of God cometh?" He answered, "The kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 17:21).

Therefore, at the Last Supper, that His words might not be understood in an eschatalogical sense, Jesus suddenly employed covenant instead of kingdom. For covenant suggests sacrifice which kingdom does not, and the deeper idea of suffering and death confirmed by a covenant could better express to the Jewish mind the assurance of sacrifice and forgiveness.

III. *Was the Lord's Supper introduced by Paul?*

(1) About the beginning of the twentieth century the trend of criticism manifested itself to find the origin of the Supper in the disciples, and not in Jesus. E. Renan had already asserted of the Last Supper that "nothing extraordinary took place" until the disciples, after the death of Jesus, "attached to that evening a singularly solemn meaning, and the imagination of believers spread a coloring of sweet mysticism over it."[1] Dr. C. A. Briggs held that the celebration of the Lord's Supper was commanded

[1] *Life of Jesus*, p. 266, New York.

after the Resurrection.[1] While Prof. Allan Menzies wavered as to the exact time of the institution of the Sacrament, but felt sure that the primitive disciples made their common meals so full of the remembrance of the Last Supper as to win Jesus' approval; so "If not the Master on earth, yet the Lord in heaven would be heard enjoining the repetition, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'"[2]

But it has been contended that Jesus was in no sense an institutionalist, and therefore did not organize the Church or its Sacraments. Nevertheless, it can't be denied that early in His ministry He was a prospective builder, for He said, "On this rock I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18). He laid the foundation and furnished the inspiration and principles of the Church which was to proclaim and introduce His kingdom. He trained the apostles "whom he had chosen," and though He prescribed no polity, He gave them His gospel as a program, which imperatively necessitated an organized Church, with His own appointed Sacraments, and ordained ministries for the propagation of the work of the kingdom—the spiritual and social salvation of the world.

(2) Since Baur first drew attention to the significance of the relation of Paul to the primitive Church, it has been fashionable for critics to hold him responsible for the organization of the Church and its Sacraments. Thus Johannes Hoffmann, after agreeing with Jülicher and Spitta that Jesus did not institute the Communion, sets forth the proposition that the Supper was an invention of the Apostle Paul, who in his

[1] *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 123.
[2] *The Expositor*, p. 259, November, 1898.

missionary journeys gained acquaintance with the Grecian mysteries, and used their terminology to express the sacramental value of the Eucharist to the Corinthians.[1] Wernle likewise said, "It is Paul who created the conception of a sacrament."[2] But perhaps the ablest advocate of this Pauline theory was Dr. Percy Gardner, Professor of Archæology, Oxford.[3] He advanced the opinion that the Lord's Supper had been invented by the Apostle Paul to counterbalance the influence of heathen festivals. Professor Gardner intimated that Paul, perhaps in an "ecstatic mood," had received the tradition recorded in 1 Cor. 11:23–26, but the "imagery" had been suggested to him by the Eleusinian Mysteries. Though presented with much elaboration, if the theory depended on Dr. Gardner alone, it would require no refutation, for he himself has withdrawn the hypothesis, and declared, "The notion that Paul when at Corinth may have taken a suggestion of the sacred meal from the rites carried on at the neighboring Eleusis now seems to me untenable."[4] He preferred the opinion suggested by Prof. Weizsacker, that the Lord's Supper originated in the common meals at which Jesus when alive presided and broke the bread. His manner of doing so was peculiar to Himself, and enabled Him to be so recognized after the resurrection.

But just as Dr. Gardner recalled his theory Prof. Holtzmann appeared as its champion, and asserted that "whilst the Church could stand off successfully

---

[1] *Das Abendmahls im Christenthum*, S. 150f., 252., 1903.
[2] *Die Anfrage Unserer Religion*, S. 166, 1901.
[3] *Origin of the Lord's Supper*, London, 1893.
[4] Exploratio Evangelica, p. 455, London, 1899.

the Gnostic intellectualism in the second century, it did not command similar resisting power against the kindred sorcery of the mysteries."[1] It is assumed that with Paul there began a totally new development, for addressing himself to Christians of pagan origin, he operated to carry them from the basis of pagan sacrifices by introducing a new element, the sacramental element involved in the idea of the Lord's return. The same theory has been recently revived by Drs. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake.[2]

It may be recalled that Ralph Waldo Emerson, without the exhibition of critical processes, entertained views somewhat similar to those assumed by Dr. Gardner, and felt constrained to resign the pastorate of the Second Church, in Boston. In the discourse which he delivered on that occasion he stated that while he accepted the Biblical accounts he "could not believe that Jesus meant to impose a memorial feast upon the whole world," but remarked that "the observance of the Supper as an ordinance rests upon the questionable authority of St. Paul."[3]

(3) But all the critics who find the origin of the Supper in Paul are not of one mind in their explanation of its history. For just as the origin of the Lord's Supper through imitation of the Grecian Mysteries is surrendered, O. Pfleiderer attempted to derive its origin through Paul from Mithraism, saying: "The supposition is natural that it is based on a combination of Christian ideas with the ideas and rites of the Mithra religion, as Paul might have known them

[1] *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, S. 68, 1904.
[2] *The Beginnings of Christianity*.
[3] J. Henry Thayer, *Journ. of Biblical Literature*, p. 119, 1898.

from his home in Tarsus.[1] Though Prof. Pfleiderer is so injudicious as to advance this hypothesis without the support of any historical evidence, and fancies that Mark, in two passages, "makes Jesus Himself utter Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ" (10:45 and 14:24), this unwarranted speculation was revolting even to Wellhausen, who rebukes him sharply for finding traces of Paulinism in the Gospels."[2]

Holtzmann later agreed with Pfleiderer that the Supper through Paul may have had connection with the Mithra-Service, which was practiced in Cilicia. These attemps to derive the Lord's Supper from the Mithra-Service through Paul, without any historical proof, shows the desperateness of the struggle. Harnack, discrediting this theory, says of it that "From the middle of the Second Century the Church Fathers saw in it, above all, the caricature of the Church."[3]

I have given these conjectural theories at some length that the student, if interested, may have access in the publications cited to a fuller discussion of the problems of the Lord's Supper. It may be interesting to learn how these radical views are accepted by modern critics. That the Lord's Supper was instituted by Jesus Himself has been asserted by Zahn, Harnack, Weizsacker, Lobstein, Wendt, Schultzen, Beyschlag, Sanday, Ramsay, and others. One or two quotations may show the unshaken conviction of all. Beyschlag said that the instituting of the Supper by Jesus Himself is "the most certain of all certain things

[1] *Christian Origins*, p. 158, New York, 1906.

[2] *The Biblical World*, p. 168, September, 1908.

[3] A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Vol. i, p. 118, Boston, 1902.

traditioned of him," and that without this "the whole later doctrine of the apostles concerning the Savior's death would be changed into an incomprehensible mystery."[1]

The earliest records in the Acts and the Epistles find the Lord's Supper an existing ordinance. It "continued" in Jerusalem from the first Pentecost, and the church at Corinth had its Supper of the Lord, Cup of the Lord, and Table of the Lord before it received its First Epistle (57 A. D.).

It is surprising that any should imagine that Paul, whose ministry was watched with disfavor (Acts 15:2; 1 Thess. 2:15; and 2 Tim. 1:15), should be able to foist an innovation upon the Church at a time when many apostles and early disciples were living. Had Paul invented the Lord's Supper at Corinth, or elsewhere, and had he attempted to perpetuate it by coining the injunction: "This do in remembrance of me," it would have worked his downfall, for the Cephas party and other enemies would have impeached him as a base impostor.

The Old Testament and Judaism constitute the background of Christianity, therefore in our interpretation of the words of Christ and the apostles, our inclination should be "not to go outside of Jewish literature and Jewish customs." And historical criticism has clarified the documentary value of the New Testament, for now with rigid exactness it has made the abandonment of late dates for the Gospels imperative, and turned the tide of the world's scholarship to accept them as products of the first century.

---

[1] *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 155, 1891.

Modern criticism at one time was very free in its speculative attacks on the Supper, and viewed it as a compound bearing the impress of many diverse influences, which were presumably traced to their respective sources; the sacrificial and piacular were supposed to be of Jewish origin, the sacramental and mystical Greek, and the incorporation of deity in the rite and the transformation of the elements jointly Gnostic and Mithraic.

But the Supper in its origin is not a combined mixture of foreign rites. It would be impossible to amalgamate elements geographically and nationally separated into a composite "rite so simple and bald as that portrayed in the New Testament," and make it authoritative in every church, as the Lord's Supper was, "within a generation of its origin without a trace of dissent by the scattered groups of believers in every land—Greece, Italy, Asia Minor, Palestine—let, I say," says Prof. Thayer, "a person seriously make this experiment and he will convince himself how much simpler history is than speculation."[1]

It will not be denied that after the second century ideas of incorporation and transformation of the elements were introduced, accompanied by enrichment of ritual and adoption of heathen terminology, which caused departure from the simplicity, message, and spirit of the Upper Room. But, stripped of all extraneous innovations and retraced to its origin, there is something sublime, uplifting, and consecrating in the evidential value of the Lord's Supper. Historically stratified in all the centuries it carries us back

[1] J. Henry Thayer, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xviii, p. 128, 1898.

to the rock of Christ Jesus. In it we have a monument wholly unaccountable except on the basis of a historic Christ; and it holds, from the very beginning, a distinguishing place in every church that was ever organized. As an unfailing witness it carries us back to the classic liturgies of the third century, and to Irenæus (A. D. 180), and Justin Martyr (A. D. 163), back to earlier traces at Troas (A. D. 60), and Corinth (A. D. 50), and back to Jerusalem (A. D. 30), to find Jesus with His very actions, appeals,and benedictions as He shared His table-fellowship with His disciples.

The Supper replete with His love shows what anxiety for the kingdom possessed Him that night, and how His sorrow and triumph reflected themselves in an appeal and covenant. That His followers should continue His mission and meet opposition with the courage of His own example He instituted the Supper with the token, "This do in remembrance of me." In His parting request He foresaw dark days for His Church, but with sacramental solemnity appealed to His disciples to continue His evangel at the risk of sharing His own passion, and to overcome tribulation and herald the day of the Son of man bestowed upon them, as His last testament, His blood of the covenant, the Messianic friendship, and the wealth of the kingdom (Mark 14: 24; John 15: 13; Luke 22: 29). "He came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God."

The criteria of the Lord's Supper find no explanation for their birth and meaning save in the man Christ Jesus. Those whose hands had handled the Word of Life, and could say, "That which we have

seen and heard declare we unto you," were the natural interpreters of Christ; and the united testimony of the Apostolic Church as to practice and doctrine shows that agreement and frankness rather than disagreement and collusion were the characteristics of apostolic fellowship.

Tested by enlightened criticism, the Lord's Supper retains its credentials as a Christian Sacrament, to strengthen the living, bless the dying, exalt the Church, and glorify our Lord Jesus Christ.

THE LORD'S SUPPER TEXT

Luke 22: 14–20.

	All Greek Codices and Versions (except	Dadfil)	Coptic Text Boharic	Peshitto Codd.
	14. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him.			
	15. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer.			
	16. for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.		*	
	17. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves.		*	*
	18. for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.		*	*
	19a. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them saying, This is my body.			
	19b. Which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.	19b. Omitted		
	20. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.	20. Omitted		
	21. But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me.			
			* Omit vv. 16–18	* Omit vv. 17–18

* Summary of evidence for English Reader.

TEXT, LUKE 22: 14-20.

Coptic Version Sahidic and Thebaic Oxford Pub.	Syriac Curetonian Burkitt	Syriac Sinaitic	b (+e)
14. And when the hour had happened, he reclined with the *apostles*.	14. Now when it was the season he sat down *to meat*, he and his apostles with him.	14. And it was the hour they sat down *to meat*, he and the disciples.	
15. Said he to them, With a *desire* I *desired* to eat this Pascha with you before I die.	15. Saith he to them: I have indeed longed to eat with you the Passover before ever I suffer;	15. Saith he to them: I have indeed longed to eat with you the Passover before ever I suffer.	
16. For I say to you, that I will not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.	16. for I say to you that henceforth I shall not eat it until it be accomplished in the kingdom of God.	16. for I say to you that henceforth I shall not eat it until the kingdom of God be fulfilled.	16. For I say to you . . . kingdom of God
17. But he took a cup, he blessed it: said he to them, Take this, and divide it among you.	19. And he took bread and gave thanks over it and brake and gave to them and said: "This is my body that *is* for you; so be doing for my memory.".	19. And he took bread and gave thanks over it and brake and gave to them and said: This is my body that for you (I give) so be doing for my memory.	19. And he took bread and when he had given thanks, he brake it and gave to them, saying, This is my body.
18. For I say to you, that I will not drink from now out of the *fruit* of the vine until the kingdom of God come.	17. And he took a cup and gave thanks over it and said: "Take this; divide *it* among you.		
19. And he took a loaf, he blessed it, he brake it, he gave it to them, saying, This is my *body* which will be given for you: do this for my remembrance.	18. I say to you that from now I shall not drink of this produce of the vine, until the kingdom of God come.	18. And after they supped he took a cup and gave thanks over it and said: Take this, divide among yourselves. This is my blood, the new covenant.	17. And he took a cup and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this and divide among yourselves.
20. And the cup also after their eating, saying, This cup is the new *covenant* in my blood, this which will be shed for you.		18. For I say to you, that from now I shall not drink of this fruit until the kingdom of God come.	18. For I say to you that from now I shall not drink of this fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God come.
21. Yet behold, the hand, etc.	21. But nevertheless, lo the hand of my betrayer.		

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

(References are to pages. Names of modern authors are in italics.)

א B text, 174, 183, 202
Abraham, W. H., 116
Absolution, 260
Acts of Perpetua, 254
Adoration of elements, 53, 262
Adoration of host, 264
Agape, The, 30, 59, 230, 233, 243
Amen, Use of, 237, 253
Analysis of the Mark-Matthew tradition, 158
Andersen, Axel, 271
Anniversaries, 85, 86, 135
Annual Conventions, 135
Ante-Nicene Library, 171
Anticipated passover, 270
Anticipation in Communion, 95
Antiphonal singing, 252, 263
Aphikomen, 218, 225
Aphraates, 195
Apostolic Age, The Supper in the, 229
Arabic Diatessaron, 171
Athenagoras, 109
Augustine, 93, 263
Avircius, Epitaph of, 250, 252

Bacon, B. W., 176, 277
Baptism, 67, 79
Barnard, P. M., 186
Barnes-Lawrence, A. E., 41
Bartlet, J. V., 161, 197
Barton, G. A., 276
Basil, St., 183, 253
Batiffol, Pierre, 59, 185, 271
Bauer, Bruno, 267
Baur, 281
Beet, J. A., 79
Belding, Dr. W. A., 103, 121
Berengarius, 109
Berning, W., 180, 191, 196
Berwin, Capt., 61
Betrayal, Prediction of, 221
Beyschlag, 215
Bible memorials, 80
Bickell, Dr. G., 213
Bingham's Antiquities, 261
Bishops and elders, 248, 257
Bitter herbs, The 221
Black, Hugh, 143
Blakesley, J. W., 169
Blass, F., 179, 185, 198, 199
Bogan, T. S. L., 249
Bornemann, 198
Box, G. H., 274
Brackets of Interpolation, 156, 158, 167
Brandt, W., 270
Bread of life, The, 74
Breaking of bread, 28ff., 60, 96, 237, 259
  Known in the, 36ff.
Briggs, C. A., 280
Brightman, F. E., 16
Brooke, A. E., 95, 276
Brotherhood of burning heart, 39
Brown, John, 137
Bryennios, 244
Buchanan, E. S., 181
Burkitt, F. C., 95, 157, 176, 187, 276

Cabrol, Fernand, 261
Calvin's Institutes, 93
Campbell, A., 76, 79, 89, 144
  Thomas, 144
Cane Ridge Revival, 144
Canons of Hippolytus, 116
Case, S. J., 71, 268
Celebrant of Eucharist, 64, 121, 247
Celebration, Periodic, 23

Chagigah, The, 223
Chandler, Prof. C. F., 139
Chase, Prof., 177
Christ's divinity in the Supper, 68
  humanity in the Supper, 72
Christian sacraments, 65
  Union, 90
Christmas, 135
Chrysostom, 93
Church, at Alexandria, 93
  at Corinth, 92
  at Troas, 92
Church, Catholic, 255, 262
Church, Coptic, 92
Church Orders, 59, 248, 250, 252
Church, Primitive, 230
Clark, A. C., 200, 204
Clemen, Carl, 44, 72, 178
Clement of Rome, 256, 261
  of Alexandria, 262, 270
Clericus, Johannes, 198
Codex D., or Bezae, 161, 178, 181, 188, 196
  Palatinus, 169
  Veronensis, 169
Cole, R. Lee, 101
Commemorative truths, Three, 34
Communion, First, 107, 127
  Public throughout, 262
  Grace of the, 111
  homily, 72
  hymn, 141
  of the sub-apostolic age, 240
  preparation, 15, 127
  peace, 82
  vocabulary, 241
Communion, Weekly, 113
Communion, Non-Liturgical, 231, 240
Communicants, A talk to new, 127
Companion, The Great, 119
Confessional, 201
Convention Communions, 20, 46, 150
Coptic church, 93
Corinthians, Date of Epistle to, 42
Council of Trent, 79, 109
Criticism, Modern, 264
Crosby, Howard, 69
Consecration, A misleading term, 17, 56, 60, 107
Cross, First view of, 44
Cup after Supper, 160, 175, 191, 224
  of blessing, The, 54, 215, 225
  of the Haggadah, 55, 218
  of the kingdom, 64
  misplaced, 250
  withdrawn, 250
Cup, The Paschal, 191, 215
Cup, Thanksgiving for the, 55, 81
Curetonian Syriac, 170
Cursives, 167, 187
Cyprian, 108, 116, 257, 259
Cyril of Alexandria, 93, 168
Cyril of Jerusalem, 108

Daily Eucharist, 29
Davison, W. T., 27, 30
Declaration and Address, 147
Deissmann, A., 114
Desire, With, 96, 275
Didache, 64, 107, 114, 182, 244, 248, 250, 252, 258, 274
Difference between Luke and Paul, 161
Difference between Synoptics and John, 209, 271
Disagree with W-H, 176
Disciples of Christ, 100, 137, 144
Discrepancy between Synoptics and John, 276
Doctrinal changes, 254, 260
Doctrine, 100, 105, 254ff.
Documentary evidence, 172
Drews, Arthur, 267ff.
Duchesne, Mgr. L., 242

Early Service, 262
Easter, 84, 280
Eating and drinking unworthily, 129
Eating together, 28
Edersheim, Dr. A., 216, 220, 224
Elders and bishops, 248, 257
Elements, The, 15, 245, 249, 258
Eleusinian Mysteries, 53, 282, 283
Elijah and the passover, 226
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 283
Emmaus, 36, 87
Ephraem the Syrian, 93, 195
Epitaph of Avircius, 250, 252
Errett, Isaac, 148
Eschatology and the Supper, 271, 278
Eucharist, 60, 237, 249
  for the dying, 109, 264

Eucharistical processions, 56
Eusebius, 277
Evidence, External, 172, 177
Internal, 191
Extempore worship, 62]

Faith, Christian, 241
Family idea in the Supper, The, 90
Feet-washing, 69, 217
Fellowship, 54, 233
Social, 245
Fellowship with demons, 239
Ferrar group, 184
First Communion, 127
Fox, Norman, 29
Frankland, W. B., 177, 237
Freer, C. L., 172
Friendship of Jesus, The, 32

Gardner, Dr. Percy, 241, 282
Garrison, J. H., 16
Gladstone, W. E., 23, 116
Gnosticism, 260, 282, 287
Goguel, M., 268
Goodspeed, E. J., 176
Gore, Chas., 116, 258
Gospel in the Supper, The, 88
Gospels, Dates of, 157
Grace of the Communion, The, 111
Grecian Mysteries, 282, 283
Gregory, C. R., 173, 184
Griesbach, 179, 200
Guest-chamber, The, 46
Guy, D. S., 265
Gwilliam, G. H., 177

Haggadah, The, 218
Haggadah, Cup of the, 55, 212, 215
Hale, Edward E., 33
Hallel, Cup of the, 55, 141, 228
Harnack, A., 52, 184, 255, 269, 284
Hastings' Dict. of Christ and Gospels, 47, 169, 186
Hastings' Encycl. of R-E, 200
Haupt, Erich, 196
Hawkins, Sir J. C., 159, 166
Hebrew-Christian editorship, 197
Hehn, 196
Hesychius, Recension under, 186
Hoffmann, Johannes, 281
Hoffmann, R. A., 185
Holtzheuer, 196
Holtzmann, Prof., 282, 284
Holy, holy, holy, 261
Homily, The Communion, 92, 149
Host elevated, 56
Hymn, The parting, 227

Ignatius, 60, 108, 248, 256
Incorporation idea, 286
Inge, W. R., 16, 18, 268
In remembrance, not in honor of Him, 62
Intercessory prayer, 226
Interpolations, 156ff.
Invisible in worship, The, 91
Irenæus, 60, 108, 250, 257, 277

Jackson, Foakes, 279
Jensen, 267
Jerdan, Charles, 122
Jerome, 174
Jerusalem, Destruction of, 279
Jesus Christ in criticism, 266
Judas, Departure of, 222
Jülicher, A., 177, 180, 269, 270, 281
July, Fourth of, 64, 121
Justin Martyr, 93, 115, 168, 244–248, 250, 252, 254, 269
Jesus Christ, The mythic theory, 267

Kalthoff, A., 267
Karpas, The, 217
Keble's view of adoration, 56
Ken, Bishop, 123, 128
Kennett, R. H., 95, 230
Kenyon, Sir F. G., 202
Key-words, 192
Kiddusch, Cup of the, 55, 207, 210, 215
Kingdom, Cup of the, 65
Kingsbury, T. L., 214
Kiss of peace, 214, 254
Known in the Breaking of Bread, 36

Lake, Kirsopp, 179, 186, 189, 279, 283
Lamb, Paschal, 270
Lambert, J. C., 96, 177, 210, 241
Lard, M. E., 73
Last Supper, 157, 192, 198, 207, 212, 276
Levens, J. T., 35, 56, 98, 105, 177
Lichtenstein, Ad., 164

Lightfoot, John, 217
Lightfoot, J. B., 198, 243
Lights, Meaning of, 237
Lincoln, President, 120
Liturgies, The early, 198, 244, 260, 287
Lobstein, 284
Lockton, W., 195
Loew, Dr., 178, 179
Loisy, A., 272
Longer text, The, 168, 175
Loos, Chas. Louis, 151
Lord's Supper, 88, 92, 224
  a memorial, 80, 116
  an interpretation, 77
  and the Disciples of Christ, 144
  in the apostolic age, 229
  in sub-apostolic age, 240
Lord's Supper, Names of, 102
Lord is risen indeed, The, 86
Lost Church Order, 240
Love in the Supper, 31
Love-feasts, 30, 130
Lucian, Recension of, 186
Luke, Sources of, 159, 165
Luke, Proto-, 159, 166, 205

McLachlan, H., 176
Maclaren, Ian, 124
MacLean, A. J., 182
Maclear, G. F., 15, 275
Marcion, 190
Mackintosh, H. R., 113
Margoliouth, G., 178
Mary Magdalene, 46
Mark-Matthew, 158ff.
Mass, 107, 255, 263
Matthei, 179
Matthew, Aramaic Gospel of, 159
Maurer, O. E., 49
Meal, The Supper a, 244
Memorial, The Supper a, 22, 121
Memory-Time, The, 20
Memphitic Catena, 168
Menzies, Allan, 281
Merx, A., 167, 191, 211
Millennial Harbinger, The, 76, 79
Milligan, George, 157
Mischna, 208
Missa catechorum, 262
Missa fidelium, 262
Mithraism, 246, 284, 286
Mysteries, 283

Nero, Persecution under, 234
Nestle, E., 178
Neutral text, The, 167
Nevern churchyard, 23
New communicants, 127
Night of the betrayal, 24
North, Frank Mason, 39
Novation, 270

Offertory, The, 245
Old and the new in the Supper, The, 50
Origen, 197
Original Greek, New Testament in, 156, 173, 178, 184, 191, 196
Origin of Supper, 264
Oxford Magazine, 202

Paganism, 241, 246, 284
Paley's Evidences, 87
Palmer, Wm., 16
Palestinian Church, 158
Pamphilius, Recension of, 186
Parallels of Last Supper, 190, 196
Paschal lamb, 76, 222, 270
Paschal table, 213
Passover blessings, 214, 215, 219, 227
  companies, 49
  a feast of the home, 47, 90
  meaning of, 62
  night, 25
  ritual, 207, 212
  service, 96
Passover, Christ our, 63
Paul-Luke text, 160, 163
Paul at Troas, 118
  originator of Supper, 280
Paul's knowledge of the Supper, 42
  tradition of Eucharist, 42
Pax, The, 214
Pendleton, W. K, 151
Perry, Alfred Morris, 159, 175, 197
Persecutions of Christians, 136
Perowne, J. J. S., 78
Perpetua, Acts of, 254
Peschitta, 169, 170, 181
Pfleiderer, O., 283
Pilgrimage of Delvia, 252
Pilgrim's Progress, 134
Pliny, Epistle of, 100, 115, 242
Plummer, A., 163
Prayer, 230, 236

Pre-Paschal celebration, 274
Preparation, 276
Presbyter-bishop, 248, 254
Presence, The real, 105
Primitive Church, 231
Propitiation in the Supper, 258, 263
Protestants and Liturgy, 242
Proto-Luke, 159, 166, 205
Puritan, New England, 94
Pusey, E. B., 105

QUARTERLY THE CHRISTIAN UNION, 18
Quarto deciman controversy, 277

RADBERTUS, 109
Ramsay, Sir W. M., 60, 157, 177, 273, 284
Real presence, The, 105, 110, 258
Recensions, 186
Reinach, Solomon, 203
Remembrance in Supper, 22, 39
Renan, E., 280
Reservation, 265
Resurrection, The, 84, 86
Reville, Jean, 272
Richardson, R., 151
Righteousness of the kingdom, 66
Risen indeed, The Lord is, 86
Robertson, A. T., 43, 168
Robertson, J. M., 267
Robinson, H. McA., 161, 197
Rome, Supremacy of, 248, 260
Roman Canon, 263
Rosenau, Rabbi W., 211

SACERDOTALISM, 198
Sacrament, 100, 263
Sacramental deflections, 59
Sacramental idea in the Supper, The, 100, 243
Sacrificial idea, 268
Salmon, George, 159, 177
Sanday, W., 96, 169, 176, 202, 209, 284
Sanders, H. A., 167
Schaefer, Rudolf, 182
Schmidtke, Alfred, 174
Schmiedel, 193, 196
Schultzen, Fr., 43, 183, 185, 196, 284
Schweitzer, A., 271
Scrivener, F. H., 178
Seceder church, 145
Self-communion, 128
Self-consecration, 17
Self-examination, 131, 137
Self-preparation, 16, 128
Shorter text, The, 167, 195
Skene, W. F., 29
Sinaitic Syriac, 170
Smith, David, 26, 35, 48
Smith, Robertson, 26
Smith, W. B., 267
Sop, The, 208, 222
Sources of Luke, 159, 165
Souter, A., 174, 180, 202
Spirit of the Communion, 15
Spitta, 270, 281
Srawley, J. H., 163, 200, 209, 248, 251
Stone, B. W., 145
Strauss, D. F., 267
Streeter, B. H., 166, 205
Sub-apostolic age, Supper in, 240
Substance and accident, 109
Sunday worship, 242, 243
Sunday with Paul, A, 117
Sursum corda, 15
Swete, H. B., 29, 30, 187
Synagogue Service, 229, 253
  open to Gentiles, 234
  Preaching in, 243
Synoptic Problem, 95, 164, 169
Syriac Sinaitic, 170

TABLE OF DEMONS, 165
Table-talk, 92, 151
Tatian, 171, 187
Taylor, Jeremy, 33
Tennyson, 98
Tertullian, 108, 116, 168, 189, 190, 247, 259, 263
Testament of our Lord, 248, 252, 260
Text-forms, 167, 185, 191
Text, Bifurcate, 165
Text, Problems of, 181
Text, Western, 161, 167, 175, 179, 190
Textual criticism, 156, 185, 273
Textus Receptus, 162, 177, 185, 190, 201
Thanksgiving, 56
  for the bread, 65, 75, 82
  for the cup, 54, 75, 82
Thayer, J. Henry, 70, 274, 283

Theology and the Lord's Supper, 269
Theories explained, 195
Thomas distrusted abstract reports, 18
Time of celebration, 242
Times of refreshing, 98
Tipi-Wakan, 20
Tischendorf, 167, 179
Titus of Bostra, 168
Totem worship, 268
Trajan, 242
Transposition of the cup, 269
Transubstantiation, 59, 105, 110, 270
Troas, Church at, 92, 118

Union, Christian, 90, 146, 150
communions, 150
Unleavened cake, 218, 220
Upper room, The, 164, 213

Versions, 167, 172, 178, 188
Viaticum, 109, 133, 201
Victor of Rome, 277
Von Dobschutz, Ernest, 130
Von Soden, Hermann, 173, 186
Vows, Communion, 263
Vulgate, 174, 181

Warren, F. E., 239, 243
Washing the disciples' feet, 217
Washington at Communion, 99
Water in the Sacrament, 269
Weekly communion, 113, 118, 149, 237
Weiss, Johannes, 197
Weizsacker, Prof., 282, 284
Wellhausen, 284
Wendt, 284
Wernle, 282
Westcott and Hort, 155, 161, 172ff., 179ff., 188, 198
Western Non-Interpolations, 156, 199
Western text, 65, 161, 167, 175
Williams, J. W., 135
Williams, W. (Pantycelyn), 134
Wilson, H. A., 202
Wilson, J. M., 198
Wine in communion, 269
Wood, H. G., 265
Wooley, R. M., 209, 247
Wordsworth, Bishop John, 174, 258
Worship, Sacrificial, 88
Worthy communicant, 129
Wright, Arthur, 164, 272
Wright, L., 231

Year, New, 137, 140
Old, 137

Zahn, T., 172, 269, 284